University of Alberta

Soldiers, Heroes, Men:
Marlborough, Wellington, and the Warrior as Model of Ideal Masculinity

©

by

Leslie Robertson

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in English

Department of English and Film Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2005

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

0-494-08723-4

Your file Votre référence
ISBN:
Our file Notre reference
ISBN:

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

War has been central to human, and especially to masculine, experience. War and those who wage it have been foundational to our understanding of what it means to be human and to the construction of what it means to be a man. The Dukes of Marlborough and Wellington, military titans both, are prime examples of the important relationship between military heroism and ideal masculinity. In the wake of the trauma of the Civil War, many in England found it difficult to celebrate the ideology of heroic masculinity in the old way, and unease about the dangers posed to the nation by soldiers aroused fierce antimilitarism. Writers such as Dryden, Marvell, and Rochester grappled with the contemporary distrust of the warrior that undermined that ideology. The most important military figure of the early eighteenth century, Marlborough, was first celebrated--by writers such as Prior, Addison, Philips, Oldmixon, and Congreve--as the hero of the nation and the embodiment of all the masculine and martial virtues, and then fell as the antimilitarism and distrust of soldiers so dominant in the period reasserted themselves in the texts of such writers as Defoe and Swift. The Civil War had disrupted the emulatory function of the heroic; Marlborough's fall from grace may be read in large part as a symptom of this disruption, as may the popularity in this period of parody and the mock-heroic. The Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, and the celebration of Charles Edward Stuart as hero, played a key role in the return of martial masculinity to a position of cultural centrality in Britain, prefiguring the romantic militarism and militaristic nationalism that

supported the preeminence of Wellington as national hero and embodiment of the nation in the nineteenth century. Wellington was fiercely criticised by some, such as Byron and Hunt, but celebrated by most, including Scott and Tennyson. This nineteenth-century reassertion of the ideology of heroic masculinity was seriously challenged in the wake of World War One, but it has continued to play an important role in the culture and politics of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Acknowledgements

I would like first of all to acknowledge the generous help of my committee, especially of my endlessly patient supervisor, Juliet McMaster. Special thanks go to Lesley Peterson and Peter Midgely, who have been the best of colleagues, critics, cheerleaders, proofreaders, and—most important—friends. I don't think I could have finished without them.

Preface

Contemplating a dissertation-length study of the representation of military men in the Restoration and eighteenth century, as I did when I began this project, I was immediately faced with an overwhelming problem: how to limit the topic so as to make it manageable. There is a wealth of material, both primary--fiction, poetry, drama, periodical literature and news reports, political pamphlets--and secondary--critical, biographical, and historical--to choose from, far more than can be accommodated within the limits of a single dissertation. My first task, therefore, was to draw boundaries, to decide the limits within which I would work. Such limits are sometimes arbitrary and often regrettable, for they require the exclusion of many works both relevant and worthy of consideration, but in the pages that follow I shall explain the rationale for my choices.

I early decided to exclude naval figures from consideration. That decision usefully contributed to keeping the dissertation within manageable limits; it also sharpened the focus of my subject. The navy and the army aroused very different feelings in the British, as I note in Chapter 2. A naval hero was a rather different animal from the military hero, and his exclusion from this discussion seemed both useful and justified.

The next question was what dates to use as beginning and end points for my central discussion. Wilfrid Prest, in his recent book *Albion Ascendant: English*

History 1660-1815, defends his choice of beginning and end dates in terms relevant to my project:

> The time frame within which any historical narrative or interpretation is presented inevitably influences its contents and direction. Thus beginning in 1660 serves to emphasize both the manifold legacies of the mid-seventeenth century English Revolution, and the firm rejection of its more radical aspects, even before the demise of the republican regime. . . . As for 1815 rather than 1783, 1789, or 1832, the conclusion of the last of many wars fought over the centuries between England and France plainly marked a major turning point, no less in domestic matters than foreign policy . . . . (vii)

As I read more widely and deeply in the period I realised that "the manifold legacies" of the Civil War were also my concern, and they became the focus of Chapter 2, but also that the exploits and reputations of the two military giants of my chosen period, the first dukes of Marlborough and Wellington, would become the pillars on which I structured my dissertation. Marlborough and Wellington form a natural pair. Not only were they routinely linked and compared in Wellington's time and later as no other military heroes were, as noted in chapter 5, but British history boasts few military heroes of equivalent stature. Other military heroes there were in the eighteenth century, but none rose to the sustained heights of importance and popular acclaim of these two.

In order to set the stage for my discussion of the representation of military heroes in the post-Civil War period, especially of Marlborough, it proved necessary to explore the traditions informing such representations. I could make sense of the marked distrust of military heroes in the post-Civil War period only by examining, if cursorily, the history--military, cultural, and literary--that produced it. The result was Chapter 1. This first chapter also includes an overview of the importance of masculinity as a defining category in the representation of military heroes, a theme that informs my discussion throughout the chapters to follow.

Just as a discussion of Marlborough requires some consideration of events that led up to his campaigns and affected his representation, so my discussion of Wellington must necessarily extend beyond 1815 and the immediate aftermath of his great victory at Waterloo, to consider his representation during the last decades of his long life and immediately after his death. Given the enormous and long-ranging importance to the Victorians of Wellington and the military, masculine, and nationalistic values he represented, it then seemed necessary to pursue the representation of the military hero through the century and beyond. The result was Chapter 6, which ranges considerably beyond the period under principal examination here to trace the threads that bind the material of the discussion to our own time. In addition, the events and increasingly militaristic character of the past few years, not foreseen when this dissertation was first begun, made it irresistible to consider how the issues I discuss elsewhere in the dissertation affect our own time. Thus, in addition to the central consideration of the representation of the period's two great exemplars of martial masculinity, Marlborough and Wellington, the dissertation provides a brief survey of later representations of the military hero.

In selecting the primary texts for my discussion, I have chosen to focus on work that undertakes in some way to represent historical rather than fictional figures. This approach fitted well with my decision to make Marlborough and Wellington and the literature about them the pillars on which the rest of the dissertation would be built. Moreover, since fictional representations of military figures have already been extensively discussed by scholars specialising in individual authors--such as Martin Battestin on Henry Fielding and Melvyn New on Laurence Sterne--and by David McNeil in *The Grotesque Depiction of War and the Military in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*, I wished to examine chiefly material from different genres than the fictional. While I have paid some attention to satirical texts (as in the brief discussion of *Jonathan Wild* in Chapter 4), a general survey of the traditions of satirical verse is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Finally, I simply like poetry, and while I could not confine my choice of texts to poetry without distorting my discussion and leaving important aspects of martial masculinity unaddressed, I nevertheless chose poetry for my primary texts whenever possible.

One of the questions with which I began was why the representation and subsequent reputation of Marlborough and Wellington--both military leaders of extraordinary abililty, both successful against foes (and French foes, no less) themselves of legendary stature--differed so markedly. Why had Marlborough's reputation collapsed in a welter of distrust and condemnation, while Wellington, despite the political turmoil of his years in government, remained the unquestionably great hero of the nation? The dissertation really grew outwards from that initial question. Hence, the period between these two towering figures--encompassing most of the eighteenth century--became of less significance to the dissertation. Although Britain was frequently at war during this period, and although there were other military heroes of importance produced by these wars, no other figures--with the exception of Nelson, a naval hero-- reached the stature of Marlborough and Wellington, and the names of no others were paired with either of them in the way that they were with each other. I wished therefore to examine the differing nature of their reputation and representation, a wish that necessarily focussed my attention on the periods in which they lived and worked and shifted it away from the long period between them. In my discussion of that intervening period in Chapter 4, I therefore concentrate on how and why the representation of military heroes as exemplars of ideal masculinity and embodiments of the nation had shifted, and not on the whole range of representations of military heroes, historical and fictional, in the course of the eighteenth century.

History is necessarily important to my discussion, but this is primarily a literary and not a historical study, so I have restricted historical analysis to those places where it provides the necessary context for an understanding of the literature. To understand the changes in representations of Marlborough between 1704 and 1712, for example, one must take into account the lingering after-effects of the Civil War and the widespread fears of a reccurrence of civil unrest, especially the fears that military men could instigate such unrest. One must also understand the trajectory of Marlborough's military career and the political environment within which he operated and within which those writing about him necessarily operated. Equally, some discussion of Britain's growing international power and the military, political, and cultural contexts within which Wellington and contemporaries who wrote about him lived and worked is necessary to an understanding of the representation of him as national hero. I have not, however, undertaken to provide a full history of either the War of the Spanish Succession of Marlborough's day or the Indian campaigns and French and Napoleonic Wars in which Wellington played such an important role. Nor have I attempted a balanced survey of changes in military practices and technologies or of the numerous military conflicts throughout the period under study; the breadth of the period and the multiplicity of such conflicts, as well as the nature of the dissertation, preclude such a survey. Instead, I have focussed on those literary works that help to illustrate the important patterns and shifts under study, and discussed only as much history as is necessary to understand them. Reference to additional works of history have been supplied where appropriate, usually in footnotes.

No doubt gaps remain; some of these--such as the representation of military heroes in the eighteenth century who never attained the stature of Marlborough or Wellington but who are nevertheless worthy of study--indicate future research directions. But in this dissertation I have endeavoured to provide a wide-ranging discussion of an important and neglected topic: the interrelationship between masculinity, nationalism, and the representation of military heroes, especially of two of the most praised and discussed of such heroes, the Dukes of Marlborough and Wellington.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction: Literary and Cultural Traditions of the Warrior Hero................1

Chapter 2: "For all men would be cowards if they durst": Post-Civil War England and the Problematic Nature of Heroic Masculinity..49

Chapter 3: Heroic Masculinity and the Duke of Marlborough: Inheritance and Change...91

Chapter 4: Greatness and its Discontents: Changing Notions of Heroic Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Britain...140

Chapter 5: The Duke of Wellington, Romantic Heroism, and the Construction of Heroic National Manhood...171

Chapter 6: Everything Old is True Again: or, the Post-Wellingtonian Soldier and the Retrenchment of Heroic Masculinity...218

Works Cited...265

Chapter 1

Introduction:

Literary and Cultural Traditions of the Warrior Hero

Is there an antidote to the perennial seductiveness of war? And is this a question a woman is more likely to pose than a man? (Probably yes.)

Susan Sontag, Regarding the Pain of Others *(110)*

"Oh, Rhett, why do there have to be wars?" . . .
"There'll always be wars because men love wars. Women don't, but men do--yea, passing the love of women."

Scarlett O'Hara and Rhett Butler, in Margaret Mitchell's Gone With the Wind *(Chp XIV; 258)*

War is central to human, and especially to masculine, experience. Samuel Hynes notes wryly, "The historian Will Durant calculated that there have been only twenty-nine years in all of human history during which there was not a war in progress somewhere. And surely if he had looked harder he could have filled in those empty years" (*The Soldier's Tale* xi). Given the ubiquity of war in human societies, it only stands to reason that war and those who wage it should have been central to our understanding of what it means to be human, and that the warrior should be foundational to the construction of what it means to be a man, even today, when few men in our society are called upon to perform the warrior role:

> The soldier hero has proved to be one of the most durable and powerful forms of idealized masculinity within Western cultural traditions since the time of the Ancient Greeks. Military virtues such as aggression, strength, courage and endurance have repeatedly been defined as the natural and inherent qualities of manhood, whose apogee is attainable only in battle. Celebrated as a hero in adventure stories telling of his dangerous and daring exploits, the soldier has become a quintessential figure of masculinity. (Dawson 1)

War is the ultimate proving ground for masculinity, for both individual men and the culture as a whole. As Leo Braudy writes, "it is preeminently in war that men make themselves men in the eyes of other men and in their own" (56). The man who exemplifies the masculine virtues in the ultimate testing ground of manhood--war--becomes a model for other men to follow, even for those men (the vast majority) who have not experienced and never will experience warfare, the standard by which their own daily performance of masculinity is measured and against which they measure themselves. The warrior, therefore, as Carol

Adams writes, may be regarded as "the epitome of the masculine man" (301).

Gender identity, like all identity, is shaped and experienced from two directions, the inner and the outer:

> Identity has two sides. One faces inward, to the core of the individual, to his own confidence in being uniquely himself, and in the consistency and stability of his self-image through space and time. The other looks outward, to his society; it rests on his confidence in being recognised by others *as* himself, and on his ability to unify his self-image with a social role. (Kahn, *Man's Estate* 3)

As Judith Butler notes, a human being is neither "a passive medium on which cultural meanings are inscribed [nor] . . . the instrument through which an appropriative and interpretive will determines a cultural meaning for itself" (12). Instead, each individual engages in a lifelong negotiation with culturally constructed notions of gender, a negotiation that manifests itself in performance. Such negotiation happens on both an individual and a societal level. Terry Eagleton points out that "ideologies are usually internally complex, differentiated formations, with conflicts between their various elements which need to be continually renogotiated and resolved" (45). And, as argued above, at the core of culturally constructed notions of masculinity with which both individuals and the larger culture must negotiate the terms of such performance is the figure of the military hero.

To examine the military hero as a significant figure is also, of course, to examine the culture that produced and used it. Donald K. Fry notes that such a hero may be "seen as the embodiment of the projected ideals of a heroic society" (6); he is thinking primarily about *Beowulf* and the Anglo-Saxon culture that produced that work, but his observation may be extended, I think, to other, less overtly heroic societies. Jonathan Rutherford describes, for example, the overwhelmingly martial nature of the dominant mode of masculinity in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (11-12). Societies produce for themselves heroes who embody those qualities most valued by it; they then represent those heroes in forms that reflect both contemporary conditions and needs, and the continuing influence of inherited traditions and forms. Certainly the literary figure of the heroic warrior has deep roots in the past; the heroic warrior has been a figure in English and other European literatures since their earliest manifestations. For a variety of historical and cultural reasons, however, the literary construction of the heroic warrior, relatively stable for so long, came under intense pressure in England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The establishment of a standing army, the development of the financial mechanisms necessary to fund it,[1] the increasing professionalisation of the military, and the growing distance of the nobility from its original function as a warrior caste[2] all served to move the experience and perception of soldiering away from the traditional ideological construction of the heroic warrior and closer to a modern military model that was more efficient, more closely tied to the centralised state, but also far less evocative as a literary discourse. The trauma of the Civil War and the political instability (or fear thereof) that followed reinvigorated a deep-rooted English antimilitarism and made the military man a figure more to be feared than to be admired or emulated. The development of the popular press, with its detailing of scandals, personal failings, and political manoeuvrings surrounding the practice of military heroism,[3] also put stress on the older ideal of the heroic warrior. In addition, the gradual but extensive alterations in the construction and perception of gender that many scholars and critics have identified as taking place over the course of the century put further pressure on the traditional construction of heroic masculinity.

---

[1] The essential text in this field is John Brewer's 1989 study, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. Brewer emphasises the vital importance of the development of what he calls the "fiscal-military state," which transformed English government and laid the foundations for the military and economic might of the British Empire.

To say that later representations of the heroic warrior derive, at least in part, from the tradition that preceded them is not to say that they are not also related to the circumstances under which they were made. Stuart Hall emphasises "cultural practices" in his discussion of representation: "It is participants in a culture who give meaning to people, objects and events. . . . In part, we give objects, people and events meaning by the frameworks of interpretation which we bring to them. In part, we give things meaning by how we use them, or integrate them into our everyday practices" (3). Participants in culture use and shape tradition, using it creatively, not statically, in order to create cultural meaning. There have been many attempts to define that slipperiest of terms, culture. Stuart Hall's attempt to separate the cultural from the biological seems relevant in this context:

---

[2] Royalty was also increasingly removed from any military function. The last English monarch to command troops personally in battle was George II against the French at Dettingen in 1743 during the War of the Austrian Succession. The willingness of Charles Edward Stuart to ride with and personally lead his men in the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion subsequently played a role in his heroic representation. See Chapter 4.

[3] The activities of the press played a major role in transforming the representation of the Duke of Marlborough from hero and saviour of the English nation to contemptible threat to English liberty, for example. See Chapter 3.

> Culture, we may say, is involved in all those practices which are not simply genetically programmed into us--like the jerk of the knee when tapped--but which carry meaning and value for us, which need to be *meaningfully interpreted* by others, or which *depend on meaning* for their effective operation. Culture, in this sense, permeates all of society. It is what distinguishes the "human" element in social life from what is simply biologically driven. Its study underlines the crucial role of the *symbolic* domain at the very heart of social life. (3)

7

Hall is talking about much more than gender here, but his words seem particularly apt when discussing the construction and representation of gender. Of course, feminist theorists have long emphasized the need to separate the biological from the social when considering gender, but this separation has more often been made when thinking about femininity than about masculinity. Masculinity is clearly as variable a construct as femininity: "The word 'man' is perplexing because each historical period, every society, and each group within a society interprets the raw material in its own way" (Stimpson xi). Masculinity, then, is neither fixed nor unitary, but shifting, often contested, and plural (Nixon 295, 297). Many writers have drawn attention to the need to subject masculinity to the same kind of scrutiny accorded to femininity in the past few decades. Harry Brod, for example, points out the benefits to both men and women of explicitly considering the construction and representation of masculinity:

> While *seemingly* about men, traditional scholarship's treatment of generic man as the human norm in fact systematically excludes from consideration what is unique to men *qua* men. The overgeneralization from male to generic human experience not only distorts our understanding of what, if anything, is truly generic to humanity but also precludes the study of masculinity as a *specific male* experience, rather than as a universal paradigm for *human* experience. (Brod 40)[4]

---

[4] Brod's appeal for the establishment of men's studies was made in 1987, but Jacqueline Murray notes in her introduction to a book twelve years later that "despite the earnest eloquence of Brod's *apologia*, resistence to the new men's studies continues" (ix).

Yet reflection about the nature and functioning of masculinity, its status as cultural creation rather than natural manifestation, has its dangers, too, as Peter Schwenger points out:

> Within the masculine mode, though, the despair that shadows a reflexive life becomes peculiarly intensified by its subject matter. To think about masculinity is to become less masculine oneself. For one of the most powerful archetypes of manhood is the idea that the real man is the one who acts, rather than the one who contemplates. The real man thinks of practical matters rather than abstract ones and certainly does not brood upon himself or the nature of his sexuality. To think about himself would be to split and turn inward the confident wholeness which is the badge of masculinity. And to consider his own sexuality at any length would be to admit that his maleness can be questioned, can be revised, and, to a large degree, has been created rather than existing naturally and irresistibly as real virility is supposed to. Like MacLeish's perfect poem, the perfect male "must not mean but be." Self-consciousness is a crack in the wholeness of his nature. (110)

Schwenger's statements seem particularly suited to a consideration of that most masculine of figures, the warrior, of whom self-reflection is hardly required, a point made also by Tennyson in "The Charge of the Light Brigade":

> "Forward, the Light Brigade!"
> Was there a man dismayed?
> Not though the soldier knew
> Some one had blundered:
> Their's not to make reply,
> Their's not to reason why,
> Their's but to do and die:
> Into the valley of Death
> Rode the six hundred. (9-17)

Or as George Bernard Shaw sardonically has one of his characters say in *The Devil's Disciple*, "I never expect a soldier to think" (Act III; 100). As always, the unexamined most requires examination or, as Hegel noted, what is familiar (*bekannt*) is often not really known (*erkannt*) precisely because it seems so familiar (qtd by Brod 2-3).

The particular mode of masculine ideology to be examined here is that of the heroic warrior. "In the development of modern ideas of the hero, as in so much else," writes Robert Folkenflik, "the Restoration and eighteenth century are of crucial importance, and an examination of the period from this perspective may help us to see the sources of our own notions of heroism" (10).[5] The importance of such an ideology to any society actually waging war is obvious, but its utility extended and extends far beyond the battlefield and the barracks to affect the overall construction of masculinity. In fact, the figure of the warrior and the virtues associated with him have been so central to the construction of masculinity that, as Graham Dawson puts it, "military virtues such as aggression, strength, courage and endurance have repeatedly been defined as the natural and inherent qualities of manhood" (1). In other words, the martial is so deeply rooted in constructions of masculinity that its characteristics and values have been thoroughly naturalised. The life of a fighting man may not in fact be impressively heroic or morally unimpeachable; his conduct is nevertheless governed by the code, and so, to a large extent, is that of other men, even those who never have the opportunity to act as warriors.

War itself may often fall short of the glorious promise of its representation. Whatever the heroic ideology underlying warfare, the unheroic fact is that feeding an army has generally been more difficult and ultimately more important than winning battles. As Vegetius, an authority much respected by medieval commentators on war, wrote, "A great strategy is to press the enemy more with famine than with the sword" (qtd by France 10). Both Marlborough and Wellington understood the importance of such details and their military successes often owe as much to their command of logistics and supply as to their military genius.[6] The military historian David Chandler notes among Marlborough's "basic strengths" his ability "to distinguish the essentials in an administrative problem--often the provision of food, forage, transportation and gold," his "minute eye for detail," and his "distinct gift for making existing systems," however inadequate or inefficient, "work well or at least adequately" (328). Wellington was similarly good at handling the tedious but vital details of logistics and supply. "The success of military operations [in India]," he wrote with typical deprecation of difficulties, "depends upon supplies; there is no difficulty in finding the means of beating your enemy either with or without loss; but to gain your object you must feed" (qtd by Keegan, *The Mask of Command* 115).[7] John Keegan notes that Wellington's "despatches from India and from Spain alike are monotonously concerned with four-footed beasts of burden" (*The Mask of Command* 114). But it is difficult to construct heroic narratives capable of inspiring men to heights of emulation from such mundane but crucial details as the baking of bread, the making of sound footwear, the laundering of uniforms, the grazing of horses or bullocks, and the punctual payment of wages.[8] Effective military leadership requires the ability to manage such details with assurance and consistency perhaps even more than it requires the ability to conduct a battle or exhibit mastery of other, more glorious and more obviously masculine, martial skills. Nevertheless, and not surprisingly, such pragmatic aspects of the military experience have played very little part in the construction of the ideology of heroic masculinity that has done so much to lure men to model themselves on military heroes. Actual military victories might be won without battle ever being joined: "It is preferable to subdue an enemy by famine, raids, and terror, than in battle where fortune tends to have more influence than bravery" (Vegetius, qtd by France 12). The narrating of war has always been much more glorious than the waging of it. That this should be so is hardly surprising; an unpleasant and potentially deadly activity, and one that may also be more subject to luck than to martial skill or to quality of character, must be cloaked under a mantle of glory in order to ensure the willing participation of men who aspire to heroic status. Of course, not every man will have the opportunity to enact the ideal in actual battle, but every man has the opportunity to exercise the martial virtues in daily life. Like other ideologies of gender, the ideology of heroic masculinity functions more as ideal to be sought than as ideal to be grasped. It may also function as a stick with which to beat men over the head, to make them feel inadequate and hence in greater need of the support of the very ideology that renders them abject. Hence, the ideology of heroic masculinity is self-perpetuating.

---

[5] I return to this subject--the roots and manifestations of our modern construction of heroic masculinity--most explicitly in Chapter 6.

---

[6] Winston Churchill records an inscription in a copy of Vegetius's *De Re Militari* at St. Paul's School asserting that Marlborough had studied that very volume as a schoolboy. Churchill is sceptical of both the adequacy of Marlborough's schoolboy Latin and the applicability of the military principles there expounded to contemporary military circumstances, but concedes that he may have been able to "extract various modern sunbeams from this ancient cucumber" (I.44).

[7] Wellington's disciplined attention to the unheroic details of military action was renowned. Stanhope's *Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington* is full of fascinating examples, such as Wellington's care always to record accurately the distance of marches in India with the use of a measuring wheel (12) and his awareness of the need to guard against ill effects when feeding horses "green food": "Now green food is at times very useful in a campaign--but then great care must be taken not to overwork them at those periods . . ." (75).

---

[8] Consider the logistical demands of just one of these necessities: "The basic measure of food which we need to take into account is that a man living a fairly active life needs about 1 kg of bread (or the calorific equivalent) to feed him per day. Packhorses could carry 110-150 kg, enough to feed 150 men for a day, so a force of 3,000 would need 140 horses for a single day's food. Each horse takes up about 2.5 m of road, so that in single file they would be strung out along 350 m of road." The horses also needed to carry fodder, "because except at the most favourable times of the year they could not fend for themselves without losing condition. . . . Pack animals cannot carry large or awkward objects, their packs need careful balancing and they must be emptied at night. They also need to be fed, and so consume much of their carrying capacity" (France 35). Moreover, "there were definite limits to what could be carried, imposed by roads, weather and seasons and by military necessity--for mobility could be compromised by too elaborate a baggage-train" (France 36). These details only begin to hint at the complexity of the task of feeding and supplying an army.

Of course, the ideology of heroic masculinity is not always unitary or internally consistent, but this lack of unity and consistency is, perhaps paradoxically, essential to its strength:

> If ideologies are not as "pure" and unitary as they would like to think themselves, this is partly because they exist only in relation to other ideologies. A dominant ideology has continually to negotiate with the ideologies of its subordinates, and this essential open-endedness will prevent it from achieving any kind of pure self-identity. Indeed what makes a dominant ideology powerful--its ability to intervene in the consciousness of those it subjects, appropriating and reinflecting their experience--is also what tends to make it internally heterogeneous and inconsistent. (Eagleton 45)

Other forms of masculinity thus compete with heroic masculinity for dominance and, at various times and in various places, have challenged it for cultural dominance. I argue in the ensuing chapters that the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries in England were among those times and places. But it has never been entirely displaced. Periods of seeming weakening of the ideology of heroic masculinty may instead be read, therefore, as periods of necessary renegotiation.

The Classical Tradition

The classical tradition has exercised a particularly important influence on representations of the heroic warrior in the English tradition. "Classical influence," writes R.M. Ogilvie of early modern England, "direct and indirect, derived from the spontaneous imitation of authors or through the traditions of European culture, affected almost every man and almost every sphere of activity" (xiii). Further, as Lin Foxhall has written, "Ancient myth and classical philosophy in particular have been subjected to a kind of ancestor worship, providing templates for gender hierarchies in general and especially men's superior places in them" (Introduction, *When Men Were Men* 3). The literature and art of the classical world provide some of the earliest prototypes for the representation of the heroic warrior, prototypes that would retain their cultural currency for many centuries to come. Such representations had their roots in lived experience. "In every primitive society, every able-bodied man is a warrior," Frank J. Frost notes. In the Mycenaean world depicted by Homer, military standing seems to have been limited to the aristocratic class (Frost 9), whereas in classical Greece it applied to all who qualified for citizenship. The later development of the hoplite warrior occurred contemporaneously with the the emergence of the classical *polis;* all citizens of the classical city-state in most of the Greek world were warriors (Croally 47). They, and all those associated with them (including wives, children, and slaves), had reason, therefore, to be concerned with the nature of military obligation and the ethical and personal dimensions of that role. The most important model for the character and conduct of the heroic warrior was, of course, provided by Homer. The authority of the Homeric epics for the ancient Greeks was such that war and the warrior ethos at their heart continued to provide "the most important material for both poetic and historical discourse"; specifically, they--especially the *Iliad*--"championed war as the ultimate human experience, where valour could be proved and everlasting fame won" (Croally 50). John Keegan describes the essential attributes of Homeric heroism as "disregard for personal danger, the running of risk for its own sake, the dramatic challenge of single combat, [and] the display of life-and-death courage under the eyes of men equal in their masculinity if not in social rank"; he further notes that the Homeric "celebration of the heroic past was to determine Alexander [the Great]'s"--whom Keegan considers the archetypal heroic leader-- "approach to life" (*The Mask of Command* 15). The standards set for warriors by the Homeric epics were revered long after the world depicted in them had vanished.[9] Important later Greek cities, families, and individuals found it necessary to trace their descent from the ancient heroes (Frost 14), and the code of conduct of the Homeric warrior "persisted long after any need for it had passed. The Greeks never forgot that their ancestors were heroes" (Frost 15).

Graham Shipley writes that "it is often said that the Greek citizen was above all things a soldier. . . . There is no doubt that the ideology of collective fighting bulked large in the mentality of the emerging and developed polis" (18). Although Shipley goes on to problematise this conception of the ancient Greek world, he nevertheless acknowledges that the "ideological importance of war for ancient (largely male, civic) culture, pre-selected and handed down to us, cannot be denied" (22). Shipley's parenthetical qualifications are significant; soldiering for the Greeks was intimately connected to the concept of citizenship, which was, in its turn, linked to gender. Citizenship, soldiering, and manhood together, therefore, conferred the benefits and obligations of public life. If war can be represented by both the ancients themselves and modern historians and commentators as the central organizing principle of Greek civic society, this says something about the actual power structures of that society: "The selection of war as the paramount activity can be regarded as an attempt to direct energy towards maintaining a particular social structure, one in which citizen was dominated by aristocrat, non-citizen by citizen, female by male, and barbarian by Greek" (Shipley 23). Such representation, in other words, and not surprisingly, does ideological work. And it continued--and arguably continues--to do so.

---

[9] Hugh Bowden has argued, however, that the world of the classical Greek polis was much closer to that of Homeric epic than has generally been thought: "It seems difficult to me to reconcile the centrality of the Homeric poems in the classical polis with the idea that the society they describe was so different. . . . I argue that the *Iliad* was in fact the product of a polis-based society, and that its subject-matter--heroes and warfare--had a clear message for all those who lived in the polis" (45).

The actual behaviour of Homeric warriors may not have accorded with later standards of heroic behaviour: "To topple city walls, to slaughter the defending champions, to drive away fat cattle, to carry away gold and silver, and prisoners for ransom and maidens for pleasure--these are the finest accomplishments of the Mycenaean gentleman, idealized by Homer and bitterly mocked four centuries later by Euripides in the *Trojan Women*" (Frost 6). Translator Don Taylor has called *The Trojan Women* "the most shattering and complete condemnation of the atrocities of war in any language" (x). "Any sensible man must hate war," the half-mad Cassandra cries (Euripides 93). And Euripides, through the words of the lamenting women of defeated Troy, offers many reasons why this should be so: "I've lost my home. I've lost my children. Everything. / No grief can encompass what I feel. No funeral song. / Flow, tears, for a city, and family, shattered past hoping" (Euripides 102). The atrocities pile up throughout the play: the women of Troy are allotted to their conquerors as slaves, Cassandra the consecrated virgin is designated concubine to Agamemnon and goes mad, Andromache's son Astyanax is taken from her to be thrown off the battlements to his death (a sentence that horrifies even Talthybius, the Greek emissary sent to deliver and execute it). The chorus voices the despair of the women for their ruined city, a despair that seems to reach beyond the merely human:

Is that the cry
Of seagulls screaming for their young
On the sea shore? No. Women of Troy,
Wives for their husbands screaming,
For their dead sons, daughters weeping desperately
For mothers too old to live slaves for long.
Your pools for freshwater swimming, that trackway
Where you always loved to go running,
All obliterated now. (Euripides 110)

Lest these complaints might seem to apply merely to the vanquished, Euripides is careful to remind us that the victorious Greeks too have suffered and will continue to suffer as a result of the war, as Cassandra points out to her mother:

These Greeks,
For the sake of one woman, and one moment
Of uncontrollable lust, sent a hunting party
To track down Helen, to smoke her out,
And it cost them tens of thousands dead! . . .
And when they came here, to the banks of Scamander,
These Greeks, then they began to die,
And they kept on dying. And for what reason?
. . . those who became the war god's victims

> Had forgotten what their children looked like.
> They weren't washed and shrouded and laid to rest
> By their wives' loving hands: and now
> Their bodies lie forgotten in a foreign country.
> And things were no better at home. Their women
> Died in the loneliness of widowhood,
> Their fathers became childless old men,
> Who had bred up their sons . . . for nothing. . . .
> Oh yes, the whole Greek nation
> Has a great deal to thank their army for! (Euripides 92-93)

And their sufferings will worsen, for the gods who brought them to victory have now decisively turned against them.

Yet, however bitterly aware these women and their author may be that war brings with it untold miseries and even that warriors sometimes behave less than honourably, they do not reject the warrior's role, his importance, or his essential manliness. Hecuba weeps over the small, battered corpse of Astyanax and laments not the fact of his death but the manner of it, specifically that he did not die as a warrior:

> My little darling . . . what a wretched, meaningless death
> Has been meted out to you! If you had died
> On your feet, defending your city,
> In the full glory of your young manhood,
> Having tasted the pleasures of marriage,

> One of the god-kings of Troy, everyone
> Would have called you a happy man. . . .
> But though your child's soul
> May have glimpsed or sensed the glories
> You were born to, they have slipped from your grasp
> Before you were old enough to enjoy them. (Euripides 123-4)

Dying as a man in honourable battle would, then, have made him a god-king; death as a helpless child can only be wretched and meaningless. Even Cassandra, driven to frenzy by her sufferings, wildly enumerating the disasters war has brought upon Trojans and Greeks alike, does not go so far as to deny the honour due to a warrior who has fought to defend his homeland, an honour unobtainable without war. Her brother Hector, she says,

> proved, in action, he was the greatest of men.
> And now he is gone. Dead. And all this
> Has been the direct result of the coming of the Greeks.
> Supposing they had stayed at home? We would never
> Have seen Hector's glory, all that brightness
> Would have remained hidden! (Euripides 93)

She even finds reason to be thankful for Paris, to whose actions Andromache, among others, bitterly attributes their defeat and impending slavery (Euripides 102): "And Paris. He married / The Daughter of Zeus. If he hadn't married her / Who would have sung songs in his honour in our palaces?" (Euripides 93). War may be hell, but its participants are "the greatest of men," and without it their greatness would not have had its necessary opportunity to shine. The ideology that identifies masculinity with the role of warrior is powerful indeed.

It remained powerful and was reinforced under the Romans. Coppélia Kahn draws attention to how, during the English Renaissance and for centuries thereafter, "Romanness *per se* [was] closely linked to an ideology of masculinity" (*Roman Shakespeare* 2), and that ideology was based on a definition of masculinity that assumed martial action and virtues as its basis. The linkage predates the Renaissance and is clearly rooted in Roman actualities. The god of war, who had been feared but hardly admired by the Greeks (Foxhall, "Natural Sex" 68),[10] was raised to new heights of importance by the Romans. Mars was the ancestor of the Roman race through his fathering of Romulus and was honoured as, "next to Jupiter, the greatest patron of the State" (Grant and Hazel 219). Ares, on the other hand, was the father of the twins Phobos ("panic") and Deimos ("fear"), who accompanied him on the battlefield. Although fearsome, Ares was rather stupid and could easily be outwitted by Athena, the goddess of strategy and true courage in battle (Grant and Hazel 45-6). Mars's importance was reinforced in the last years of the Republic, when "hero-generals" gained positions of great importance and influence (Boren 118), culminating in Julius Caesar's rise to power, the end of the Republic, and the coming of the Empire. Caesar himself claimed descent from Mars through Iulus, the ancestor of Romulus: "He [Caesar] was in effect deified; a college of priests headed by Antony was set up to be in charge of the cult. His statue was placed in the temple of Romulus" (Boren 130). The later years of the Republic witnessed the elevation of the man of war to a central place in Roman politics and history. "The greatest figures of the late Republic, such as Caesar and Pompey, were men of great military reputation," writes Henry Boren, although he notes that the earlier requirement that all Roman citizens who wished to be elected to public office be required to serve at least ten years with the army had fallen out of use: "The sociopolitical changes that led to the fall of the Republic may indeed relate to the Roman aristocracy's losing touch with the army" (Boren 155). Roman writers also frequently attributed the putative decline in Roman morals and the long decline in Rome's power to its departure from the military ideals of the early Republic.

---

[10] In the *Iliad*, for example, he has been characterized as "a cowardly bully" (Williams 94), and the classical scholar Edith Hall notes that, "paradoxically, Greek representations of wars with barbarians nearly always portray him as the divine supporter of the non-Greek side," as in the *Iliad*, where he favours the Trojans (128-9). Ares may have "figured large in the list of deities to whom the youths of Athens swore their ephebic oath," (E. Hall 128), but his aid clearly could not be relied upon.

The English Tradition

I. The Anglo-Saxons

The earliest examples of the heroic warrior in English literature occur in

Anglo-Saxon verse, and *Beowulf* is the most important text to be considered in this connection. Not only is Beowulf a warrior before all else, but Allen Frantzen has called him one of "the most manly men in Old English literature" (92).[11] In his seminal essay "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics," first published in 1936 and often reprinted, J.R.R. Tolkien delineates the work's relevance to the present discussion in highly useful terms: "Beowulf is not, then, the hero of an heroic lay, precisely . . . . *He is a man, and that for him and for many is sufficient tragedy*" (23; italics in original).[12] Tolkien points also to what he calls "the creed of unyielding will" (25), which he sees as central to the concerns of Anglo-Saxon literature (and to the broader Northern European heroic traditions from which it derives) in general and to *Beowulf* in particular. Although he does not connect this creed specifically to the construction of masculinity (and in 1936 it was hardly possible that he should), it requires no great stretch of the critical imagination to do so now.[13]

---

[11] According to Frantzen, Hrothgar, the aging king whose kingdom is collapsing under the force of Grendel's attacks, is the other (92). Other critics have been less impressed with Hrothgar's manliness or with his performance of ideal heroic masculinity: "Hrothgar indeed ought to be much more of a role-model to the Danish people than he is; he seems the empty form of one, speaking the right words and fulfilling many ceremonial duties but unable to take any lead in defending his nation" (Irving 355).

[12] Leo Braudy points out "the interplay between the words for 'man,' the words for 'man of high rank,' and the words for 'warrior' in much literature, including *Beowulf* (5-6).

[13] For a close examination of Tolkien's essay and of masculinity in *Beowulf*, see Clare A. Lees's "Men and *Beowulf*" (1994).

So how is being a man "sufficient tragedy" for Beowulf and for other men? Well, as Tolkien pointedly acknowledges, if to be a man is to be a hero, then to be a hero is to court death: "But we may remember that the poet of *Beowulf* saw clearly: the wages of heroism is death" (Tolkien 31). The heroic man must not only endure death manfully when it comes; he must seek it out, he must meet it in battle, a battle that he, being a mortal man, can only lose. Being a man, it seems, is a fool's game, one in which victory (achieving full heroic manhood) means extinction. But Beowulf is not a fool, and to represent him as a fool would be to misunderstand the ideology of masculinity that he exemplifies. He is a hero and a man to emulate, even if such emulation will almost certainly lead to death. The trick is to make that death either sufficiently appealing or sufficiently unimportant in comparison to the rewards of masculinity for men to feel the full force of the ideology. It seems likely that *Beowulf* and other examples of Anglo-Saxon heroic literature were intended to provide models for masculine emulation: "Indeed it was perhaps the main purpose of such poetry to provide models of behaviour for semi-aristocratic warrior classes" (Irving 347). Edward B. Irving has described how such emulation operates within texts like *The Battle of Maldon*, in which Byrhtnoth "actively transmit[s] his standards of soldierly behavior by explicit instruction and authority," as well as by example (352). *Beowulf*'s usefulness in this regard is even clearer: "There should be no doubt whatsoever--it is amazing that anyone has to state this point explicitly--that, for the poem's audience, Beowulf is always a superb role-model" (Irving 355).[14]

The extant text of *The Battle of Maldon*, originally written *ca.* 1000, is a fragment of a longer work. It describes the last stand of a band of warriors in Essex, led by Byrhtnoth, against an opposing band of Danes. Offered the chance to pay the invading Danes off, Byrhtnoth insists on the need for contests to be decided by force of arms:

> Tell your people a much less pleasing tale,
> that here stands with his company an earl of unstained
> reputation,
> who intends to defend this homeland,
> the kingdom of Æthelred, my lord's
> people and his country. They shall fall,
> the heathens in battle. It appears to me too shameful
> that you should return to your ships with our money

---

[14] Nevertheless, some critics have cast doubt on exactly this point. James W. Earl, for example, writes, "*Beowulf* is an ethical poem of the Christian Anglo-Saxons, but its ethics are not Christian, and its hero is not an Anglo-Saxon; so it is not clear how the poem's ideals might actually have functioned in the actual world of the audience" (69). He goes on to note the relationship between the contemporary audience for these poems and the Germanic heroic code governing *Beowulf* and other examples of Anglo-Saxon heroic verse as outlined by Tacitus: "Did Byrhtnoth really have a *comitatus* like an ancient Germanic warlord? Did tenth-century soldiers really feel the force of the heroic code defined by Tacitus nine hundred years earlier? If we answer in the post-heroic, pre-feudal terms of the tenth century we will say both yes and no. But in order to understand Germanic heroism in whatever form it takes, we must always start by going back to Tacitus" (Earl 81). Restoration and eighteenth-century writers were, of course, more likely to know of the Germanic heroic tradition through Tacitus than through Anglo-Saxon texts which, as Roberta Frank points out, were little read in the period (Frank 32).

> unopposed, now that you thus far in this direction
> have penetrated into our territory.
> You will not gain treasure so easily:
> spear and sword must first arbitrate between us,
> the grim game of battle, before we pay tribute. (21; lines 49-61)

Bryhtnoth's confident pride leads him to allow the Danes across the water that protects the Anglo-Saxons from attack. At first the battle goes well, as Byrhtnoth's warriors fight manfully against their foes:

> So the valiant ones supported one another,
> the warriors in the battle, directed their minds eagerly
> to which of them might first with his spear there
> wrest life from a doomed man,
> soldiers with weapons. (23; lines 122-6)

However, when Byrhtnoth falls in the resulting battle, many of his men desert him, betraying not only their lord but their stated identity as heroic warriors:

> Thus Offa had said to him earlier in the day
> in the assembly, when he had held a meeting,
> that many there spoke bravely
> who would not hold out later in time of need.
> (27; lines 198-201)

Clearly, verbal self-identification as one who meets the standards of heroic masculinity is insufficient; men must prove their manhood by performance of the ideology, not by mere assent to it. The young warrior Ælfwine reinforces this point, scorning the fleeing warriors for their cowardly failure to live up to the code of heroic masculinity they all profess:

> Remember the time that we often made speeches over mead,
> when we raised pledges while sitting on a bench,
> warriors in the hall, about fierce encounters:
> now we can test who is brave. (27; lines 212-15)

Masculine identity is thus always rooted in externals. A man does not feel like a man or even talk like a man: he acts like a man; otherwise other men do not know to identify him as such. The ideology of heroic masculinity thus requires of its adherents a constant performance of worthiness, as noted by scholars of masculinity in other contexts: "Unable to internalize his identity, an act that stabilizes and fixes one's idea of self, the human male has no choice but to seek meaning through interaction with the external world" (Wicks 12). This necessity remains a constant in any study of the history of masculinity. Another warrior in *The Battle of Maldon*, Offa, makes a similar point, calling on the men to continue the fight. Either they will prevail, in which case they will render their leader's death more glorious, or they will fall beside him, an end fitting for warriors. The words of Offa and Ælfwine inspire the remaining warriors to fight on, eager to prove their worth with deeds, even if (or perhaps especially if), those deeds result in death:

> Steadfast warriors around Sturmere will have no cause
> to taunt me with words, now my beloved one is dead,
> that I travelled home lordless,

> turned away from the fight; but a weapon must take me,
> pointed spear and iron sword. (29; lines 249-53)

And so they fall beside their lord, as good warriors--and true men--should. If they cannot be victorious, at least they will have asserted incontrovertibly the validity of their claim to manliness.

These speeches are reminiscent of similar sentiments in *Beowulf*. When the men are mourning the loss of their comrades to Grendel's mother, Beowulf reminds them that the most appropriate way to mourn fallen warriors is to continue the fight in which they fell: "It is always better / to avenge dear ones than to indulge in mourning. / . . . Endure your troubles to-day. Bear up / and be the man I expect you to be" (97; lines 1384-5, 1395-6). True manhood is thereby rooted in performance. Again, after Beowulf falls in his battle with the dragon at the end of the poem, the young warrior Wiglaf is the only one of the twelve men accompanying Beowulf on his quest who remains with his fallen lord:

> No help or backing was to be had then
> from his high-born comrades; that hand-picked troop
> broke ranks and ran for their lives
> to the safety of the wood. But within one heart
> sorrow welled up: in a man of worth
> the claims of kinship cannot be denied. (175; lines 2596-2601)

Like Ælfwine in *The Battle of Maldon*, Wiglaf rebukes the fleeing men (177-7; lines 2631-60). Beowulf chose them, considered them worthy warriors, and they were glad to take rings and other rich gifts from his hands. Now, when he is fallen, they flee, thereby proving themselves unworthy of Beowulf's high valuation of them as warriors and as men.

Noteworthy in both of these examples is the emphasis on physical action over mere emotional response. To fall in battle is the proper death for a warrior, and the proper response of warriors to a warrior's death is not weeping and wailing and despair, but action. Warriors must fight and, if necessary, fall beside those warriors who fell before them. Death in battle is the ultimate and only fulfillment of the warrior ideology these men espoused in life. Mourning the death of a warrior in such a context, therefore, takes on a special meaning. The loss of a warrior, especially one who has attained a position of leadership due to extraordinary martial qualities, is to be mourned, but it is not to be regretted. Regret is reserved for those who fail to fulfill their roles, those who flee instead of remaining to fight, as occurs in both *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon*, or for those for whom the role of warrior no longer exists, as in *The Wanderer*.

In these poems, to be a man is to be a warrior.[15] This is particularly marked in *Beowulf*, which, since its narrative is complete (unlike that of *The Battle of Maldon*), is able to develop its patterns more fully. When Beowulf sets off with his band of warriors to battle the dragon and take its treasure, the narration notes that there are twelve men in the party; a few lines later, however, it becomes apparent that there is in fact another man in the group: the slave who first found the dragon's lair and who now leads them to the site. He, however necessary his knowledge may be to the warriors, is not to be counted among the men, because he is not a warrior but a slave, no more to be counted a man than a serviceable horse might be. Again and again in *Beowulf* the reader is reminded that to be a warrior is to be a man, and vice versa. One who successfully fulfills the role of warrior and man is not necessarily a good man or a good ruler, however. The example of Heremod (59-61; lines 883-914), who was a great warrior and a mighty man but evil, shows this. The martial virtues, which Heremod clearly possesses, may not be sufficient, but they form the foundation upon which all the other virtues rest. To live and die as a warrior is to be a man and worthy of elegy; to be less than a warrior is to be less than a man. Both Beowulf and Byrhtnoth, the fallen leader in *The Battle of Maldon*, are warriors and men, successfully meeting the challenge set them by their culture. To mourn their loss is simultaneously to celebrate their success. Death in battle is not therefore the tragic loss of an individual but the fulfillment of all this society holds dear about manhood.

---

[15] Alfred David points out in "A Note on Names," included in Seamus Heaney's recent translation of *Beowulf*, that "masculine names of the warrior class have military associations": "Hrothgar is a combination of of words meaning 'glory' and 'spear'; the name of his older brother, Heorogar, comes from 'army' and 'spear'; Hrothgar's sons Hrethric and Hrothmund contain the first elements of their father's name combined, respectively, with *ric* (kingdom, empire, Modern German *Reich*) and *mund* (hand, protection)" (xxxi). Masculine identity, therefore, is informed at every level by the demands of the warrior function.

It must be noted that the Anglo-Saxon tradition of heroic masculinity was not very well known in the eighteenth century. As Roberta Frank has noted, during that time "Greeks and Romans were 'in,' Anglo-Saxons were 'out,' and the leaders of taste could be brutal towards those who like Thomas Hearne, in

1726 the first editor of *The Battle of Maldon*, persisted in antiquarian labors" (Frank 33). The tone and mindset of the Anglo-Saxon poets were, she argues, distinctly uncongenial to the eighteenth-century mind: "It is not surprising that the heroic idealism of *Maldon*, its summons to perfection and self-sacrifice, was unfashionable in the eighteenth century, which shunned anything that smacked of 'enthusiasm' or noble stupidity" (Frank 32). She acknowledges, however, that the situation had changed considerably by the nineteenth century: "But the nineteenth century was brimming with men refusing to leave sinking ships. All gentlemen knew that they must be courageous, show no signs of cowardice, be loyal to comrades, and meet death in battle without flinching" (Frank 32). Interest in heroic Anglo-Saxon verse, therefore, rose in the nineteenth century and its influence consequently increased along with its cultural, and also its political, utility.[16]

Kathryn Sutherland notes, however, that the "political contentiousness of Saxon studies" significantly predates the Victorians (185): "From their beginnings in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, in the researches of John Leland and Matthew Parker, of William Camden and Richard Verstegen, Anglo-Saxon studies were underpinned by motives of political justification, cultural hegemony and national pride" (185-6). For example, those who argued for the limitation of royal prerogative in the seventeenth century sought support in a reading of

---

[16] The increasing cultural importance of heroic masculinity in the nineteenth century, of which the rising interest in Anglo-Saxon and medieval literature and culture is a symptom, will be further discussed in chapters 5 and 6.

English history that traced "English liberties (among them the freedom to choose the king and to define the scope of his rule) and parliamentary privilege . . . to pre-Norman laws and institutions" (Sutherland 186). Hearne himself maintained, in the face of historical evidence otherwise, the truth of the legend that the Saxon king King Alfred had founded Oxford, thereby both "rooting Oxford's Civil War loyalty to the Stuarts in its early debts to the legitimate sovereign's Saxon Ancestor," and identifying "the persecuted and office-denied Hearne as the latest true representative of the University's heredity loyalty" (Sutherland 187-8). Sutherland also notes that Hearne, in his diaries, linked his identity as Non-Juror to "the heroism of a distant age" (Sutherland 188). These political uses of the Anglo-Saxon heroic tradition were primarily applied, however, to politics on a national rather than on a personal scale; Anglo-Saxon heroism was valorised chiefly for its application to national character and political resistance, not as a model on which modern men could pattern their gender-based identities. Further, unfamiliarity with the language rendered the texts generally unavailable except to specialists, thereby reducing their usefulness to literary and political culture as a whole. But they remain important in the context of this discussion for the light they cast on the roots of the ideology of heroic masculinity.

II. The Middle Ages

It is sometimes difficult to see through the mists of later reconstructions of chivalry and the middle ages. Debra N. Mancoff has written of the increasing importance of such revisioning of the past in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries:

> Men looked to the heroes of chivalry as models of manly behaviour. And, as modern men strove to be like ancient knights, a curious turnabout occurred. It was the image of the knight that saw the greater change. He was reinvented as a modern gentlemen. The promotion of chivalry as an ideal for manhood began, perhaps unintentionally, with the recovery of romance literature in the eighteenth century. (30)

As a refinement of the ideology of heroic masculinity, the cult of chivalry, as developed in the high middle ages, has continuing appeal. And that appeal was largely constructed by literary means, as Richard Barber has noted: "The apogee of the knight as fighting man--and hence as hero--coincided with the first flowering of a literature in everyday language" (55). Indeed, the representation of chivalry was ultimately of more importance than the lived reality of it even at chivalry's height, as John Keegan notes: "There is considerable evidence that, even in its heyday . . . , knightly warfare was not what it seems to us or what its devotees believed it ought to be at the time" (*A History of Warfare* 297). Like all such ideological codes, chivalry was an ideal to be celebrated rather than a reality to be lived, a model for emulation and aspiration rather than a straightforward description of the lives of real men, and real knights--their numbers decreasing--often fell far short of its demands.

If one is to judge by a text like *The Canterbury Tales*, knights abounded in late medieval England; at least, a rather large number of men are described as knights in the tales. At least ten tales in *The Canterbury Tales* feature men designated as knights among their characters, including *The Knight's Tale, The Man of Law's Tale, The Wife of Bath's Tale, The Franklin's Tale, The Merchant's Tale, The Squire's Tale, The Physician's Tale, The Tale of Sir Thopas*, several of the stories in *The Monk's Tale*, and *The Second Nun's Tale*. In fact, however, decreasing numbers of eligible men were proving willing to take up knighthood in the later Middle Ages (Keen, *Chivalry* 144). In the decades after the composition of the *Tales* the problem just got worse; in 1430 and again in 1439 men with incomes exceeding £40 "were enjoined to assume the rank of knight (although there is ample evidence that many did not do so)" (Thomson 110). Not only were decreasing numbers of men proving willing to take up knighthood in the later Middle Ages, the knight's importance as fighting man was also decreasing. English armies after 1327 consisted entirely of paid soldiers rather the feudal levies that had earlier been of central importance (W. Anderson 182). Although the traditional mounted knight could still affect the outcome of a battle, the general tendency of success was in favour of the long-scorned foot soldier (W. Anderson 182). In fact, the Battle of Crécy in 1346 had to a large extent proved the knight obsolete in battle (P.B. Taylor 209). Yet the knightly code of chivalry still exercised a profound influence despite the increasing obsolescence of the class that had invented it:

> The ideals and customs of chivalry grew up . . . as the code of a military aristocracy whose hereditary occupation was fighting. It was not a romantic code of courteous behaviour, but a pragmatic set of rules to be followed on the battlefield. During the later Middle Ages . . . , however, when the dominant social ideal became the landed gentleman rather than the professional soldier, chivalry moved from the military realm of business and work to the social realm of ritual, ceremony, and play. (Bornstein 9)

Johan Huizinga, in his classic study *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, long ago posited this decline of chivalric values: "In spite of the care taken on all hands to keep up the illusion of chivalry, reality perpetually gives the lie to it, and obliges it to take refuge in the domains of literature and of conversation" (98). "Hard realities" he argues, "were bound to open the eyes of the nobility and show the falseness and uselessness of the ideal" (Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* 99), leading the "blasé aristocracy" of the later Middle Ages to laugh "at its own ideal" (Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* 90). Huizinga's thesis has been defended and extended by many historians and critics since then.

The most strenuous defender of the continued vitality of chivalry as an ideology governing the lives of many even in the later Middle Ages has been Maurice Keen. In his account of the secular chivalric orders, for example, while he acknowledges the elements of theatre and play involved in them,[17] he nevertheless insists on their continuing relevance in both social and military terms:

> There was a very great deal of play involved in the ritual and ceremonial of the secular chivalric orders, it is true, but the men who bore them had not, for the most part, won admission to them lightly. The whole structure of the regulations of the different orders about tables of honour and augmentable badges and books of adventures were geared to a single, central end, the celebration of martial prowess. This brings out an important point. . . . it is what really gives the lie to the charge that is so often brought against the secular knightly orders, that the concern with outward show and ceremony which their statutes so markedly evince is a sign of the decadence of late medieval chivalry. . . . [T]he high price that they set upon loyalty and courage was quite genuine. . . . (Keen, *Chivalry* 198)

Keen rests his defence of the continuing relevance of the knightly code of chivalry to the later Middle Ages, despite evidence of its increasing dependence on ostentatious show, principally on two factors. First, he draws attention to the bellicosity of the period, which made the codes of chivalry still relevant:

---

[17] In doing so, he is responding to Huizinga's influential work, both in *The Waning of the Middle Ages* and in the seminal text in discussions of the play and performance elements of war, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture* (especially chapter 5, "Play and War").

> [Chivalry] was at once a cultural and a social phenomenon, which retained its vigour because it remained relevant to the social and political realities of the time. The late middle ages were no less bellicose than the tenth and eleventh centuries, in whose warlike circumstances chivalry was born, and endemic warfare marked the culture profoundly. (Keen, *Chivalry* 219)

Of course, as noted already, the knight was increasingly irrelevant to that warfare as technology and military strategy left him behind. Second, while acknowledging that "[l]ate medieval chivalry was exhibitionist and extravagant--often to the point of vulgarity--in its ornate and imitative tendencies, and that has given it a bad name," he convincingly excuses it by arguing that "[t]his was an age in which ritual still played a vital part in social life" and "was indeed still the way in which men registered some of their most important social obligations to one another" (Keen, *Chivalry* 216). This is certainly true, but it leaves unanswered the question of just how closely related the ritual and the reality were in this period. Far from formalising and manifesting a rich reality, ritual can sometimes be a sign of emptiness at the core. The increasing obsession with chivalric ritual in the later middle ages and chivalry's growing reliance on outer signs such as coats of arms to signify worth have been read by Lee Patterson as "an indication of chivalry's lack of confidence in itself, of a gap where the signified essence ought to be" (186). The signified essence that the rituals of chivalry were supposed to embody was, of course, prowess on the battlefield as indicator of manly worth, but prowess on the battlefield was of less and less importance in the later Middle Ages.

Of course, chivalry at its best had always been impossible to live up to. It was, like the ideology of heroic masculinity in general, more an ideal to be aspired to than a reality to be lived. But it is simply not necessary for ideologies to be rational or even internally consistent in order to function effectively, as Terry Eagleton points out:

> The rationalist view of ideologies as conscious, well-articulated systems of belief is clearly inadequate; it misses the affective, unconscious, mythical or symbolic dimensions of ideology; the way it constitutes the subject's lived, apparently spontaneous relations to a power-structure and comes to provide the invisible colour of daily life itself. But if ideology is in this sense primarily performative, rhetorical, pseudo-propositional discourse, this is not to say that it lacks an important propositional content--or that such propositions as it advances, including moral and normative ones, cannot be assessed for their truth or falsehood. Much of what ideologies say is true, and would be ineffectual if it were not; but ideologies also contain a good many propositions which are flagrantly false, and do so less because of some inherent quality than

> because of the distortions into which they are commonly forced. . . . (221-2)

Eagleton's comments certainly hold true for ideologies of gender, which continue to inform human behaviour even when the gap between ideology and practice looms large. So, despite the decreasing importance of knightly masculinity in practical terms, it remained highly significant in cultural terms, both during the middle ages and long thereafter. Although, as Ruth Mazo Karras points out, "knightly masculinity was not normative for everyone," if one model of medieval masculinity were to be identified as hegemonic, the knightly ideal would certainly be it (163). It may not have been applicable to all men, but it ranked higher than the models appropriate to other, lesser men. War and the knights who fought it, despite their decreasing numbers and military effectiveness, remained central to both "the narrative political story" and to the cultural history of the middle ages: "Indeed, their martial secular culture may arguably be claimed to be, along with their Christian ideology, one of the two chief defining features of their civilization" (Keen, "Introduction" 3-4). That martial culture remained central to later conceptualizations of the period and its culture, as well, and an important strand in the tradition of martial masculinity.

III. Shakespeare and the Elizabethans

The need to locate masculine identity in action, especially in martial action--and the anxiety engendered by that need--is apparent also in the plays of

Shakespeare. Lois G. Schwoerer notes that "the soldier was portrayed in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century drama either as a cipher, a reprobate, or a discontent who inevitably clashed with a peacetime society" (10). Janet Adelman locates the origins of masculine violence in the plays in "anxieties about masculinity and female power," defining that violence-- "indeed masculine survival--as a turning against the maternal body" (3). But, as I have already argued, anxiety about masculine identity is rooted more immediately in the need constantly to affirm and display that identity through performance. Men must not simply be men, they must perform manhood, and hence are subject to necessary and continuing anxiety about the quality of their performance. That anxiety is apparent in one of the earliest and the most violent of Shakespeare's plays, *Titus Andronicus.*[18]

The relevance of a warrior-based ideology is made clear from the first lines of the play, when Saturninus, son of the late Emperor of Rome, demands that Romans militarily support his claim to the now-vacant throne:

> Noble patricians, patrons of my right,

---

[18] One might choose any number of Shakespeare's plays to demonstrate this point. *Titus Andronicus* has been chosen here largely to show how early these concerns arise in Shakespeare's oeuvre. Bruce R. Smith, in his important recent book *Shakespeare and Masculinity*, says that the character in Shakespeare's plays who exposes the need for masculinity to be achieved and performed is probably Caius Martius, the hero of *Coriolanus*: "He achieves manhood near the start of the play in a symbolic act of rebirth as he emerges, covered in blood, from the gates of the city of Corioles . . . . Just as decisively Caius Martius loses his masculine identity when he is vanquished at the end of the play by his Volscian rival Aufidius, who taunts him as 'thou boy of tears'. The very violence of Martius's reaction shows just how fragile his masculine identity is" (2-3). See also Robin Headlam Wells's recent *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (2000).

> Defend the justice of my cause with arms;
> And, countrymen, my loving followers,
> Plead my successive title with your swords. (I.i.1-4)

His claim is disputed, however, by the supporters of Titus Andronicus, whose claim to the throne--supported by the people--rests on his superior performance of the martial virtues, as asserted by his brother Marcus:

> A nobler man, a braver warrior
> Lives not this day within the city walls.
> He by the senate is accited home
> From weary wars against the barbarous Goths,
> That with his sons, a terror to our foes,
> Hath yoked a nation strong, trained up in arms. (I.i.25-30)

Faced with Titus's superior performance of heroic masculinity, Saturninus's only option, Marcus says, is to "withdraw you and abate your strength, / Dismiss your followers, and, as suitors should, / Plead your deserts in peace and humbleness" (I.i.43-5). Being less of a man, as judged by the only criterion that counts (martial prowess), Saturninus is hardly worth considering, except as a suppliant for Titus's favour. Indeed, his accession to the throne is possible only with the might of Titus's support behind him.

All would seem to be undramatically well: Rome is secure, the succession is assured, masculine virtue saves the day. But trouble quickly arises, brought about by those very masculine virtues we have just been called on to admire. Bassianus steals away Lavinia, Titus's sons defy his attempts to reassert his authority over her, Titus kills his son Mutius, and Saturninus's resentment of the favours he owes to Titus breaks out. Heroic masculinity, it seems, can maintain neither public peace and security nor family affections and loyalty. Indeed, the very perfection of Titus's performance of heroic masculinity renders him stupid and opens him up to the deceptions of Saturninus, Tamora, and Aaron. Coppélia Kahn notes that the Elizabethan and Jacobean "myth of Rome" made the masculine and martial virtues "ideological constructions coterminous with the meaning of Rome itself"; further, the "traits and behaviours proper to [Roman] men" become "almost synonymous with masculinity" (*Roman Shakespeare* 14). Shakespeare's insistence on problematising Roman virtue in his Roman plays thus insists on problematising the very ideology of heroic masculinity itself. In this he is very unlike his contemporaries; Shakespeare "takes Rome more seriously and sees its heroes more critically than others do" (Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare* 14). The ensuing action of *Titus Andronicus* reinforces this idea.

The barbarian warriors, Chiron and Demetrius, sons of Tamora, violate Lavinia, daughter of Titus, Roman general and victor over the Goths. Their rape and mutilation of her enact their mother's desire for revenge on Titus, but Tamora, no less than Lavinia, is a passive vehicle in an essentially masculine struggle. Although the rape enacts the vengeance of Tamora, it is not originally conceived as such by her sons. Chiron and Demetrius are motivated by lust, intense sibling rivalry, and the desire to "horn" Bassianus as Aaron has horned Saturninus (J.A. Roberts 36). They come on stage quarrelling violently over a woman who is not theirs to take, neither brother willing to give in to the other:

> CHIRON: I love Lavinia more than all the world.
>
> DEMETRIUS: Youngling, learn thou to make some meaner
> choice;
>
> Lavinia is thine elder brother's hope. (II.i.72-74)

Aaron recognizes the absurdity of their quarrel: "What, is Lavinia then become so loose, / Or Bassianus so degenerate, / That for her love such quarrels may be broached . . . ?" (II.i.65-67). He also, however, recognizes an opportunity to do an evil deed and therefore spurs on their anger by implying their failure to perform adequately the ideology of masculinity:

> Why, lords, and think you not how dangerous
>
> It is to jest upon a prince's right? . . .
>
> Young lords, beware! And should the Empress know
>
> This discord's ground, the music would not please. (II.i.63-70)

Although Chiron and Demetrius at first intend to win Lavinia "with word, fair looks, and liberality" (II.i.93), the idea that any women could resist their blandishments not occurring to them, Aaron convinces them to turn instead to "a speedier course than ling'ring languishment" (II.i.111): "rape and villainy" (II.i.117). To this the brothers, eager to defend their manhood, readily agree. "Thy counsel, lad, smells of no cowardice," says Chiron (II.i.133). Therefore it is clear that, despite Tamora's later anger at Lavinia's scorn for her, the rape is not in fact carried out at her command nor for her purposes. It has, in reality, as little to do with her as it has with Lavinia. It is an action carried out by, for, and between men, with the body of a woman as their proving ground, and the purpose of it is the the claiming by performance of masculine identity. Their actions might be dismissed as barbaric and therefore as distortions or inadequate misreadings of true (Roman) heroic masculinity, except that the example of female abduction and male forcefulness has already been set by Bassianius, who carried off Lavinia despite her silence and her father's protests. When the full extent of Lavinia's violation becomes known, Titus's grandson makes a comment that further erodes the barrier between barbarian and Roman:

> I say, my lord, that if I were a man,
> Their mother's bedchamber should not be safe
> For these base bondmen to the yoke of Rome. (IV.i.106-8)

Titus's brother expresses his approval of these sentiments: "Ay, that's my boy! Thy father hath full oft / For his ungrateful country done the like" (IV.1.109-10). The boy has learned well to emulate heroic masculinity: "And, uncle, so will I an if I live" (IV.1.111). The difference, then, between Roman and barbarian is more apparent than real: " The play insists on an antithesis between civilized Rome and the barbaric Goths only to break it down: the real enemy lies within" (Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare* 47). And that enemy is also the greatest of virtues: heroic masculinity itself.

The masculine focus of the action and its separation from all women, even Tamora, are further indicated by the nature of the setting in which the act is carried out. When Tamora first enters the forest, she sees it as a welcoming, pleasant place where no evil exists and even the serpent is rendered harmless:

> The birds chant melody on every bush,

> The snake lies rolled in the cheerful sun,
> The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind,
> And make a checkered shadow on the ground.
> Under their sweet shade, Aaron, let us sit. (II.iii.12-16)

Aaron will have none of this. The welcoming forest ruled by generative Venus is transformed by his words into the territory of warlike Saturn--a presiding deity more suited to the performance of martially defined heroic masculinity--and the snake becomes deadly once more:

> Madam, though Venus govern your desires,
> Saturn is dominator over mine.
> What signifies my deadly-standing eye,
> My silence, and my cloudy melancholy,
> My fleece of woolly hair that now uncurls,
> Even as an adder when she doth unroll
> To do some fatal execution?
> No, madam, these are no venereal signs;
> Vengeance is in my heart, death in my hand,
> Blood and revenge are hammering in my head. (II.iii.30-39)

Spurred on by his pitiless words, Tamora is ready even to take vengeance into her own hands: "Give me the poniard. You shall know, my boys, / Your mother's hand shall right your mother's wrong" (II.iii.120-121). This is, however, a misunderstanding on her part of the true nature of the situation. Tamora persists in seeing herself as an active participant in the violent deeds of men, but she is as little a factor in their decisions as is Lavinia. After all, what role can a woman rightfully play in an action the purpose of which is the performance of heroic masculinity? This fact is certainly understood by Titus himself, who perceives Lavinia's rape and mutilation as wounds inflicted more on himself than on her: "He that wounded her / Hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead" (III.i.91-92). Thus he represents Lavinia's violation "as both the occasion and the expression of his madness, *his* inner state . . . , transform[ing] her irremediable condition into the emblem of his" (D.E. Green 322). Lavinia is even unable to communicate what has been done to her and the identities of her rapists by any means of her own invention. It is instead her uncle who devises a means for her to communicate: "Look here, Lavinia; / This sandy plot is plain; guide, if thou canst, / This after me. I have writ my name / Without the help of any hand at all" (IV.i.67-70). Her muteness is more than physical; she is unable to break silence at all without the permission and guidance of men. Her words are not her own and are at the service of masculine concerns and needs.

While Philomela and Procne are able in Ovid's version of their story to act out their own vengeance without assistance, Lavinia is not. Just as the deed itself in *Titus Andronicus* was committed by men against other men, so revenge for it is entirely a male affair. Although Lavinia is allowed to participate in it as assistant, it is not her revenge but her father's: "Far worse than Philomel you used my daughter, / And worse than Procne I will be revenged" (V.ii.194-195). Compare this to the role taken by the women in Ovid's narrative:

> Procne could not conceal her cruel exultation. Eager to be

> the first to announce the catastrophe she had brought about, she told her husband: "The boy you are asking for is here, inside, with you." ... Philomela leaped forward in all her disarray, her hair spattered with the blood of the boy she had madly murdered. . . . Never would she have been more glad to have been able to speak, to express her glee in fitting words. (Ovid 152)

Procne's and Philomela's active ferocity only emphasises the passivity of Lavinia. Also noteworthy is the fact that Tamora is the recipient of the cannibalistic meal prepared by Titus, despite her actual non-involvement in the planning or execution of the rape. The final bloodbath of the play results in the assumption of power by a member of Titus's family. As Jeanne Addison Roberts has noted of this play, "The struggle is between men, but the necessary pawns are women . . . " (36). However fierce Tamora's anger may be, she carries out no violent action herself but merely serves as the excuse for violence others have already determined to commit. Brought to the great height of Empress of Rome, she is nonetheless able to wield no power, but becomes the plaything of Aaron, who early says of her, "I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold, / To wait upon this new-made Empress. / To wait, said I?--To wanton with this queen" (I.i.19-21). Lavinia's scope for positive action is even more limited, largely because she is, in some ways, more threatening to the public order: "Lavinia's speech--or any uncurtailed mode of signification on her part--could expose to the public (and to the audience) her subjection to the arbitrary wills of men, to the contradictory desires of father, husband, rival fiancé, brothers, and rapists" (D.E. Green 323). Thus it is necessary to silence both women, to aestheticise their sufferings, to render their experiences unreal, and finally to kill them so that the real business of the performance of heroic masculinity may continue unabated. Having proved unnecessary to that performance or unassimilable to it, they are disposable.

A similarly ambivalent, even critical, attitude towards the ideology of heroic masculinity may be detected elsewhere in the Shakespearean canon. David Riggs notes that in the history plays

> the received ideals of heroic greatness . . . invariably decay, engender destructive violence and deadly rivalries, and in the process, make chaos out of history . . . because the notions of "honour" that regulate the heroic life can never be securely realized within any stable historical form of national life. (qtd by Kahn, *Man's Estate* 51)

English history in the seventeenth century certainly followed this pattern, as increasing tension between King and Commons created tremendous instability, giving rise to Civil War, regicide, and the Interregnum. These overwhelming events could not but have an effect on the ideology of heroic masculinity.

Chapter 2:

"For all men would be cowards if they durst":

Post-Civil War England and the Problematic Nature of Heroic Masculinity

When something as cataclysmic as the English Civil War and Revolution occurs, a massive destabilization in the order of meaning is engendered.

Nigel Smith, Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660 *(362)*

The mid- to late-seventeenth century saw a succession of national traumas, and these necessarily affected the course of the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In *Hacks and Dunces*, Pat Rogers draws his readers' attention to the traumatic precursors to the eighteenth century:

> The birth of the eighteenth century was attended with four searing memories, which can fairly be called traumatic. Within the lifetime of men and women who were still active, four great events had impinged deeply on the national consciousness. I mean the Civil War, the Great

> Plague, the Fire of London and the Glorious Revolution. These happenings had personal and imaginative repercussions which were to last for generations; and not even the Restoration or the Dutch wars, the Popish plot or the Monmouth Rebellion, made quite the same durable impact. (94)

Like so many of his contemporaries, John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, was directly connected to and affected by the first and last of these four events, but it is the effect of the Civil War on his life and career (to be explored in Chapter 3) that is most relevant here.

That the Civil War should loom large in the minds of those who lived through and after it is hardly surprising.[19] It provided the first direct experience of the realities of modern warfare for most people in England, and it was--not surprisingly--profoundly unsettling to them (Donnelly 207). Unlike the

---

[19] Margaret Anne Doody argues in *The Daring Muse* that key characteristics of Augustan verse in particular owe much to the Civil War: "In order to understand Augustan poetry and how it works, we should enquire, if only briefly, why it is what it is. . . . The mixture of styles to which I have alluded as a feature of Augustan poetry can be seen as largely the result of what happened to English poetry just before, during, and just after the Civil War of the 1640s. I ought to say, rather, what happened to *some* English poetry, but the 'some' includes much of importance. The poets, like other Englishmen, were engaged in the internecine conflict . . . " (30). Doody also notes that the poetic influence of the Civil War was not just local or temporary, but had "lasting effect on the next hundred years of English poetry" (42). In particular, see the second chapter of *The Daring Muse*, "Some Origins of Augustan Practice: Civil War Verse and its Implications," for her development of these assertions. My argument about the importance of the Civil War in understanding subsequent representations of military heroes is both more extensive than Doody's, extending as it does to broader cultural patterns and preoccupations, and more limited, concentrating as it does upon the single figure of the heroic warrior.

Continent, England had had no recent experience of warfare: "In many parts of Europe it would have seemed a short and muted specimen of warfare. In England it was unbelievable" (Pennington 115). Those who survived it found it difficult to celebrate the heroic warrior in the old way.[20] "Now, all such calamities as may be avoided by human industry, arise from war, but chiefly from civil war; for from this proceed slaughter, solitude, and the want of all things," wrote Thomas Hobbes in his *Elements of Philosophy* (8), and he was not alone in his sentiments. Life and its comforting routines changed, often in unpredictable and frightening ways, and the changes could often be attributed to the arrival and activity of soldiers: "The survival or collapse of almost every economic activity could depend on the behaviour at one moment of a small number of soldiers; and nothing could be harder to predict" (Pennington 120). The Civil War was traumatic and troubling for writers and philosophers, for aristocrats and commoners, for churchmen and laypeople:

> For some, a world turned upside down might be greeted exultantly as affording the possibility of redressing social

---

[20] Many, of course, did not survive: "It has been estimated that almost 85,000 men were killed in England during the Civil Wars, that slightly more than this were wounded in the fighting and that about 100,000 soldiers and civilians died from disease as a result of their involvement in military activity" (Wroughton 2331). These are not negligible numbers in a country with a population of less than six million (*The Oxford Companion to British History* 762). Martyn Bennett estimates that approximately 3.7% of the population of England and 6% of the population of Scotland died during the wars (363). Wilfrid Prest notes that the population of England actually fell in the mid-seventeenth century, due both to losses in the war and to a lower birth rate (also partially attributable to war), and did not fully recover for decades: "Population growth resumed again in the early eighteenth century, but at a slower rate than before 1650. So the demographic peak of some 5.3m. reached in the late 1650s was not surpassed for another seventy years" (7).

> grievances or realizing millenarian dreams, while for others, it might signify only the imposition of new forms of tyranny, and for still others, perhaps in fact the majority, the feeling of disorientation might be the result of what they saw as a deeply bewildering and unsettling breakdown of authority of all kinds. (Summers and Pebworth 1)

The feelings of disorientation were due, in part, to the shifting allegiances and reversals of fortune that characterised so much of the Civil War experience. Parliamentarian and Royalist propagandists flung opprobrium at their opponents in the pamphlet wars; the sin-wracked destroyers of civil peace one day became the divinely blessed defenders of peace and security the next. Roundheads castigated Cavalier[21] soldiers as malignant, violent, debauched, sexually depraved, and godless (Roebuck 15, 18). In turn, Roundhead soldiers and military leaders found themselves, especially after the Restoration, attacked as fanatical regicides, reckless instigators of civil discord, creators of chaos, and even as agents of the devil (J. Rogers 187-8). In the process, the entire category of heroic warrior became tainted:

> Pamphlet representations of distinctly unchivalrous actions by knights and cavaliers and men at arms on both sides

---

[21] Graham Roebuck usefully traces the history of the creation and usage of these corresponding terms in his article "Cavalier" (1999).

> and accounts of soldiers as helpless victims of outrages performed by their enemies would have been equally corrosive of the glamorous literary ideas of chivalry and military glory. (Donnelly 210)

Once almost everyone celebrated the soldier as the height of human aspiration. "[T]he godlike human being," James A. Freeman says of the dominating discourse of the earlier seventeenth century, "strove to become a soldier" (23).[22] But such acceptance of the martial as the source and definition of ideal masculinity became much harder to sustain after the disruptions and horrors of the Civil War and its aftermath. After being for so long an object of admiration and model of masculine behaviour, the warrior overwhelmingly became an object of dread: "Most of all there was fear--the new and inescapable fear that the soldiers would come" (Pennington 115). Antimilitarism remained a force long after the Civil War was over: "The annihilation of the English army leaders responsible for the ejection of Parliament . . . and of the civilians who supported them showed the general hatred of military rule. The heavy taxes to support the armed forces, and the soldiers' living at free quarters in spite of taxes, accentuated antimilitarism" (Davies 332). The resultant antimilitarism[23] makes itself felt in that great seventeenth-century epic, *Paradise Lost*.[24]

---

[22] I cannot help recalling in this context Simone de Beauvoir's dry comment in *The Second Sex*: "Man enjoys the great advantage of having a God endorse the codes he writes" (691).

[23] Of course, antimilitarism pre-existed the Civil War, but the war seriously exacerbated it.

M.L. Donnelly argues that Milton "jettisoned a youthful enthusiasm for the epic tradition's glorification of the heroic man-at-arms . . . as a result of his reflections on the course of events in his country during and immediately after the first civil war" (203). Milton scholars have debated at length the nature and extent of his critique of this cultural tradition. Claude Rawson sees in it "a radical retreat from the principal subject-matter of the epic . . . : 'Warrs, hitherto the onely Argument / Heroic deemd' (IX.28-9)" ("Pope's Waste Land" 50).[25] Freeman, in *Milton and the Martial Muse: Paradise Lost and European Traditions of War*, describes *Paradise Lost* as Milton's "supreme attack on the notion of desirable conflict" (5), in which he seeks to "impugn the entire notion of virtuous militarism" (9). In Donnelly's words, Freeman finds "in Milton's greatest works not merely criticism of certain kinds of epic heroic posturing and romantic idealization of chivalry, but a bitter and thorough-going pacifism" (202). Other scholars, such as Robert Thomas Fallon (in *Captain or Colonel: The Soldier in Milton's Life and Art*), have disputed Freeman's conclusions, but--as Donnelly notes--"It is, after all, difficult to read certain famous passages in *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes* without readily seeing how the idea of a pacifist Milton *could* arise" (202-3). *Paradise Lost* is, in Michael Murrin's words, "a poem in which all the wrong people glorify military activity" (1), chiefly, of course, Satan, who "resolve[s] / To wage by force or guile eternal War" (*Paradise Lost* I.120-1) against God. Also, in a line of argument similar to my own, Diane Purkiss argues that the representation of war and soldierly activity in *Paradise Lost* reflects disjunctions created by the experiences of the Civil War between military men and traditional constructions of masculinity (236).

---

[24] For a detailed examination of the effects of the Civil War on literary discourse, see Nigel Smith's *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-60* (1994) and *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, a collection of essays edited by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (1999). Christopher Hill has, of course, done important work in this field. For example, see *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1972), *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (1984), and *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion, and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England* (1990).

[25] Rawson continues, "Milton rejected the theme of heroic warfare not by simply bypassing it . . . , but by transferring it wholly from the human to the celestial domain. The epic's traditional preoccupation with war is preserved on a plane which escapes the censures of human morality. War in the disreputable human sense is sublimated as well as 'derealized.' The War in Heaven is too high to arouse our disapproval of war, much as the mock-battles of *Le Lutrin* or *The Rape of the Lock* are too low. . . . The War in Heaven is righteous as no other war can be, as well as incapable of killing anyone" ("Pope's Waste Land" 52).

The long shadow of the Civil War continued to affect the attitudes of the early eighteenth century towards military figures. To those of a later age, the fear of a return to such damaging internal discord might seem inappropriate or excessive, but contemporaries had no way of knowing that England would safely weather the storms of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and emerge stable, prosperous, and powerful.[26] The fall from political and popular favour of the Duke of Marlborough, the most brilliant military hero of the age, both reflected and exacerbated the distrust with which many regarded such figures. The effect of the Civil War on the national consciousness--evident in both politics and literature--lingered long after Marlborough's time. "The ghost of Cromwell," writes Robert Folkenflik, "seems to hover about much thinking on heroism during the eighteenth century" (10). Pat Rogers argues that the trauma of the Civil War is still making itself felt in the 1740 version of *The Dunciad*: "The poetry is simply that much more effective because of the immediacy with which civil war then seemed to threaten, and because of the way contemporaries thought about such turmoil" (110). As late as 1790, Edmund Burke could evoke the spectre of the civil war of almost a century and a half before to raise fears about the potential destructiveness of the French

---

[26] Frank McLynn makes a similar point about the seriousness of the threat of Jacobitism before the collapse of the '45, which the benefit of hindsight has often led modern commentators to underestimate: "Historical inevitability is a destructive doctrine. From the standpoint of the twentieth century it is easy to make the mistake of seeing the Jacobite movement as inevitably doomed, and the Jacobite risings as mere 'local difficulties' along the line of march of a triumphant Hanoverian succession. Both the 'Whig theory of history', championed by Macaulay and his successors, and the Namierite orthodoxy that supplanted it in the twentieth century, consigned Jacobitism to the waste bin of history, the former explicitly, the latter by implication. It is only in very recent years that scholars have come to appreciate the gravity of the threat posed to the Whig/Hanover system by the exiled Stuarts" (63). As McLynn argues, "Those who supported the Hanoverian dynasty genuinely feared the Jacobite threat, and they were right to do so" (65). The '45 is only doomed to failure by "the historian working with hindsight and, in many cases, worshipping the god of historical inevitability" (McLynn 124). See Herbert Butterfield's *The Whig Interpretation of History* for a classic critique of a historiography that insists on viewing the past through the lens of what later came to be.

Revolution. Other civil disturbances of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, real or perceived--including the Popish Plot, the Rye House Plot, the Glorious Revolution, the Monmouth Rebellion, an uncertain and disputed succession, and the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745--added to the sense of threat and instability. David Nokes points to a range of additional factors contributing to such a sense during this period:

> The rapid expansion of London since the Great Fire had taken place in a haphazard, undisciplined way, and the increased population of the "Great Wen" was protected merely by a system of purely local constables and watches which was now hopelessly overwhelmed. While the Jacobite rebellion of 1715 and the South Sea Bubble of 1720 seemed to threaten the established order of the nation's superstructure, a kind of gang warfare erupted in London as an underworld counterpart to this disorder. Nor were the disturbances confined to London and the urban areas; rick-burning and cattle-stealing also increased, resulting in the notorious Black Act of 1728. (8)

Increased newspaper reporting of crime and other worrying incidents also added to public fears. All contributed to an underlying scepticism towards the concept of the heroic. James William Johnson concludes that the people of the age "knew from experience that all that glistered was not necessarily golden heroism" (34).

Indeed, the early adulation of the Duke of Marlborough may be considered an anomaly against the background current of scepticism about the heroic that dominated the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. After his fall, in James William Johnson's words, "military leadership, aristocratic superiority, and heroism were disjoined increasingly" (31). Events and personalities of the early eighteenth century reaffirmed this disjunction:

> George I was too torpid; the only arms that encumbered George II were those of his German mistresses, as Pope archly implied in *Epistle to Augustus*; and with the confrontation of "Butcher" Cumberland and the idiotic Bonnie Prince Charlie[27] in 1745, both Hanover and Stuart behavior confirmed the impossibility of viewing aristocratic militarism as heroic any longer. (J.W. Johnson 31)

As a result, we are faced with what Robert Folkenflik calls the *"hero absconditus"* (9), the absence of any viable, sustainable construction of the heroic. Yet the heroic is a theme much discussed in Restoration and eighteenth-century literature. Before examining the Duke of Marlborough and early eighteenth-century constructions of the heroic, it would be useful to retrace the immediate background of such constructions and examine the terms in which they are discussed.

---

[27] Frank McLynn argues vigorously that Charles Edward Stuart was not nearly so idiotic as some later historians have painted him, even that his military decisions were far more intelligent than he has sometimes been given credit for (see especially 173-5, 205-6, 259-61). And, as I argue in Chapter 4, his heroic representation did play an important role in evolving attitudes to the heroic in the later eighteenth century.

James William Johnson describes John Dryden as "spokesman for the theoretical notion of the hero in the first two decades following the Restoration" (26). George Saintsbury long ago identified the "Heroic" as providing the central unity in Dryden's dramas: "the Hero . . . takes the place of the Action, and so supplies a more flexible unity of life-interest" (x). Dryden's "primary concerns from first to last," Robert Folkenflik asserts, "involved the role of the heroic" (16).[28] Consistently, Dryden accepts the martial as the source and definition of ideal, heroic masculinity. In "An Account of the Ensuing Poem, in a letter to the Honourable Sir Robert Howard," which prefaces *Annus Mirabilis*, Dryden announces that he has

> chosen the most heroic subject which any poet could desire: I have taken upon me to describe the motives, the beginning, progress and successes of a most just and necessary war; in it, the care, management and prudence of our King; the conduct and valour of a royal admiral, and of two incomparable generals; the invincible courage of our captains and seamen; and three glorious victories, the result of all. (*Poems* I.113)

---

[28] Larry Carver's "*Absalom and Achitophel* and the Father Hero" and W.B. Carnochan's "Dryden's Alexander," both in the valuable essay collection *The English Hero* (1982) edited by Robert Folkenflik, usefully discuss other aspects of the heroic in Dryden.

He declares himself inspired by the martial qualities of his subject to heights of poetic accomplishment: "I found myself so warm in celebrating the praises of military men, two especially as the Prince and General, that it is no wonder if they inspired me with thoughts above my ordinary level" (*Poems* I.118). He defends his choice of stanzaic form on the basis of the gloriousness, the essential masculinity, and even the Englishness of his military subject matter:

> I have chosen to write my poem in quatrains, or stanzas of four in alternate rhyme, because I have ever judged them more noble, and of greater dignity, both for the sound and number, than any other verse in use amongst us; in which I am sure I have your approbation. . . . Neither can we give ourselves the liberty of making any part of a verse for the sake of rhyme, or concluding with a word which is not current English, or using the variety of female rhymes, all which our fathers practiced; and for the female rhymes, they are still in use amongst other nations: with the Italian in every line, with the Spaniard promiscuously, with the French alternately, as those who have read the *Alaric*, the *Pucelle*, or any of their latter poems will agree with me. (*Poems* I.115-6)

Warmed to martial fervour by his subject matter, he even offers the poem as a substitute for his failure to participate in battle, an obligation for all men of standing: "The former part of this poem, relating to the war, is but a due expiation for my not serving my King and country in it. All gentlemen are almost obliged to it" (*Poems* I.114). Thus he hearkens back to older notions, now under contestation, of the martial qualities and obligations at the heart of the construction of heroic masculinity.

"Of Heroic Plays, An Essay," prefixed to *The Conquest of Granada* in 1672, raises some similar issues. Dryden again disavows foreignness in general and Frenchness in particular (although he freely claims the authority of classical models): "You see how little these great authors did esteem the *point of honour*, so much magnified by the French, and so ridiculously aped by us. . . . I shall never subject my characters to the French standard" (*Essays* I.156-7). As James Anderson Winn notes, his protestations are rather disingenuous:

> As so often in his criticism, however, Dryden is constructing a theory after the fact, trying to make his heroic plays, which had been pilloried as bombast in *The Rehearsal* (1671), appear as serious as possible by emphasizing their affinities with epic and disregarding the real debts they also owe to French drama, English "Cavalier" plays, and prose romance. (146)

It is not only the seriousness of his endeavour that Dryden is defending, however, but its Englishness and its manliness, as opposed to Frenchness and effeminacy.

He attempts to situate the heroic far enough above ordinary human weaknesses to inspire emulation, yet not so far above them as to create despair of emulation. His strictures on style make claims for the need for elevation above the ordinary, in this case ordinary language: "But it is very clear to all who understand poetry, that serious plays ought not to imitate conversation too nearly. If nothing were to be raised above that level, the foundation of Poetry would be destroyed" (*Essays* I.148). French writers of heroic narratives have erred in making their heroes too virtuous to serve as exemplars, unlike wiser classical authors and those who have followed their model:

> They [classical authors] made their heroes men of honour; but so as not to divest them quite of human passions and frailties: they contented themselves to show you, what men of great spirits would certainly do when they were provoked, not what they were obliged to do by the strict rules of moral virtue. For my own part, I declare myself for Homer and Tasso, and am more in love with Achilles and Rinaldo, than with Cyrus and Oroondates. (*Essays* I.156-7).

Cyrus and Oroondates are the heroes of *Artamène, ou le grand Cyrus* by Mme de Scudéry and *Cassandra* by M. la Calprenède, respectively. Unlike the classics, prose romance was a highly feminised genre. Although certainly not all of the French romances of which these stand as representative examples were written by women, many of them were: "The prose romance was virtually the only extensive genre which women had successfully practised" (Doody, Introduction xvi). Furthermore, the gender of the authors of such works was widely known, despite such subterfuges as publishing Mme de Scudéry's books with her brother's name on the title page. In 1670 Bishop Huet had published *Traité de l'origine des romans* as a lengthy preface to a female-authored romance, *Zayde*, in which he discussed female authorship of such works. As Margaret Anne Doody notes, this "treatise was quickly translated and often republished," so that "anyone interested in prose fiction" would have been aware of the gender of so many authors of French prose romance (Introduction xvii). Dryden is thus explicitly disassociating himself and his work from a feminised and Frenchified genre and claiming instead a more manly provenance for his heroic literary endeavours.

Despite the respect in which that most heroic of genres, the epic poem, continued to be held, it was honoured more in theory than in practice:

> The high view of epic survived, with greater or less vitality, throughout the lifetimes of Dryden, Pope, and Fielding, and indeed beyond. Perhaps it has never fully disappeared. And yet there is no major epic in English nor perhaps in any of the main West European languages after *Paradise Lost*. (Rawson, "Pope's Waste Land" 48)

Dryden insists repeatedly that heroic plays should be "modelled . . . by the rules of an heroic poem" (*Essays* I.154):

> And if that be the most noble, the most pleasant, and the most instructive way of writing in verse, and withal the highest pattern of human life, as all poets have agreed, I shall need no other argument to justify my choice in this

> imitation. (*Essays* I.154)

With its goal the delineation of "the highest pattern of human life," the heroic mode is clearly intended to perform an exemplary function. And that both heroic poetry and heroic plays are centrally concerned with things military is almost too obvious to need defending. Dryden does defend his "frequent use of drums and trumpets, and . . . representations of battles" on stage, arguing that he is not being innovative in doing so, but is following conventions established by Elizabethan dramatists, including Shakespeare. He insists also that they are essential to the genre:

> But I add farther, that these warlike instruments, and even their presentations of fighting on the stage, are no more than necessary to produce the effects of an heroic play; that is to raise the imagination of the audience, and to persuade them, for the time, that what they behold on the theatre is really performed. (*Essays* I.154-5)

Interestingly, he describes this task of the dramatist--"to persuade them, for the time, that what they behold on the theatre is really performed"--in terms appropriate to the action of a military hero: "The poet is then to endeavour an absolute dominion over the minds of the spectators" (*Essays* I.155). The dramatist is heroic, it seems, not merely in terms of his chosen subject matter, but also in his heroically dominant relationship with his audience; he enacts the very heroism he celebrates.

For *Annus Mirabilis* Dryden took as his models Virgil's *Aeneid*, with its "stress upon *pietas*, that submission to providence and dedication to one's country represented by Aeneas" and the *Georgics*, from which he "drew inspiration for his poem's delight in the ordinary, everyday world (both in nature, and in the details of human occupations), and its sense of the place of labour in a divinely ordered world" (Hammond 109). In this poem Dryden "expresses nationalism against the Dutch [and] royalism against Puritan political views" (Doody, *Daring Muse* 13), creating in the process what Doody calls "one of the clearest Restoration utterances of the imperial theme" (13). Edward N. Hooker has discussed the readiness of many at the time to look for signs and portents and to "recognize the calamities of 1665-1667 as visitations of God" (291-2), a belief Dryden attempts to refute in *Annus Mirabilis* with assurances that "the disasters were but momentary interruptions in the path to wealth and glory, and that they had served to draw the King and his people together in the bonds of mutual suffering and affection" (Hooker 293). Dryden chose his strategy carefully to counter more negative readings of the events of 1666:

> Dryden was surely aware of the kinds of criticism being levelled at the naval commanders and their superiors by the "country" opposition; he could similarly anticipate that some sectarian prophets would interpret the Great Fire as God's direct punishment of the lewdness of the court. Instead of attempting to rebut such damaging interpretations frontally, as a mere pamphleteer might have done, Dryden drew upon his literary experience and

> classical reading to present the year of wonders as a series of episodes from an epic poem. His Albemarle, Rupert, Charles, and James are heroes from the grand mold, not the petty squabblers Marvell makes them out to be. The disasters suffered by the fleet and the city become part of the larger patterns of tragic fate to which all men are subject, not simply the results of human mismanagement and cowardice. (Winn 170)

In the preface Dryden asserts that the poem's "actions and actors are as much heroic as any poem can contain" (*Poems* I.114). For example, of Rupert and Albemarle, placed in joint command in April 1666 of a fleet of eighty ships, he writes,

> With equal power he does two chiefs create,
>   Two such, as each seemed worthiest when alone;
> Each able to sustain a nation's fate,
>   Since both had found a greater in their own.
>
> Both great in courage, conduct and in fame,
>   Yet neither envious of the other's praise;
> Their duty, faith and interest too the same,
>   Like mighty partners equally they raise. (47-8:185-192)

These exemplary heroes eschew the extravagant trappings of the mere appearance of heroism for the manly performance of the real thing: "With them no riotous pomp nor Asian train / T'infect a navy with their gaudy fears, / To make slow fights, and victories but vain-- / But war, severely, like itself appears" (52.205-8). The heroes of the poem are repeatedly compared to the heroes of ancient history and epic, but as heroic Englishmen, blessed by the Almighty, they outshine even them:

> Heroes of old, when wounded, shelter sought,
> But he, who meets all danger with disdain,
> Ev'n in their face his ship to anchor brought,
> And steeple-high stood propped upon the main.
>
> At this excess of courage, all amazed
> The foremost of his foes a while withdraw:
> With such respect in entered Rome they gazed,
> Who on high chairs the godlike fathers saw. (62-3.245-52).

The heroism of the English thus partakes of the divine. Prince Rupert's arrival on the third day of the naval battle is compared to the coming of Christ: "The wily Dutch, who like fall's angels feared / This new Messiah's coming, there did wait" (114.453-4). Indeed, the heroism of the English leaders is always rather more than human, viewed from a distance as the marvellous actions of superhuman beings. Dryden's absence from London during the time of these events and consequent dependence on slanted journalistic accounts could account for some of this distance, and is made to serve his exalted conception of the heroic: "His poem is no less political than the satires from the other side, but his treatment of public events in a high heroic mode, in part constrained by his physical absence from London, allows him to conduct his argument through allusion, typology, and imaginative vision" (Winn 171).

For a few years after the Restoration, James William Johnson points out, "the Stuarts basked in heroic analogies and hyperboles. Not only the academic contributors to *Britannia Rediviva* saw them in scripturally and classically heroic dimensions; such intellectually assorted types as Clarendon, Pepys, Evelyn, and Anthony Wood all subscribed to the mythic grandeur of Stuart heroism" (26-7). Dryden, not surprisingly, contributed heavily to the swell of praise, beginning with *Astraea Redux. A Poem on the Happy Restoration and Return of His Sacred Majesty Charles the Second* (1660), and continuing long after the rejoicing had worn off for most; Winn notes that "in *Britannia Rediviva* (1688), written when Charles was dead and James was clinging to a shaky throne, Dryden was still attempting to rally his countrymen to support of the monarch by recycling the imagery of Restoration" (106). But for many "the euphoria of the Restoration soon gave way to dissension" (Hammond 106), and disparities between "the real and ideal behaviour" of Dryden's Stuart heroes (Charles II and the Duke of York) soon became too obvious to ignore, making "the conventions of heroic literature and heroic posturing" more than ever objects of mockery and scepticism (J.W. Johnson 27-8). This mockery and scepticism is on display in Andrew Marvell's satirical poem "The Last Instructions to a Painter" (1667). Here

Marvell depicts "a postlapsarian state in extremis" (Riebling 143),[29] in which England's leaders pride themselves on their martial prowess, but only when the battle is metaphorical, not actual; in political quarrels they are fierce, and "accept the charge with merry glee, / To fight a battle, from all gunshot free" (229-30). "Despite their appearance of vigorous activity," Joseph Messina notes, "the heroes just talk" (299). Political foes delude themselves with visions of martial invincibility, but their boasting is illusory and laughable:

> These and some more with single valour stay
> The adverse troops, and hold them all at bay.
> Each thinks his person represents the whole,
> And with that thought does multiply his soul,
> Believes himself an army, theirs, one man
> As easily conquered, and believing can,
> With heart of bees so full, and head of mites,
> That each, though duelling, a battle fights.
> Such once Orlando, famous in romance,
> Broached whole brigades like larks upon his lance. (267-76)

Here and elsewhere in the poem Marvell employs military language merely to point out the more forcefully how it has been emptied of significance. These champions, vaunting their courage and their prowess in single combat, fancy themselves the equivalent of Ariosto's hero, but they are in fact deluded and ridiculous.

---

[29] Riebling notes that "it was a Renaissance commonplace to imagine England as a garden paradise, politically healthy and safe behind its sea barriers from the contagion of European affairs. In Marvell's poem, Elizabethan England's strength and safety are a remote dream" (143). The relevance of this imagery to the poem's depiction of innocent nymphs in an unspoiled green landscape violated by foreign interlopers is clear, as discussed below.

If their absurd delusions affected only themselves, they might provoke mockery, but not serious concern; however, such misperceptions damage the welfare of "our Lady State" (1), for whose portrait the poet is providing his instructions. Faced with the prospect of a real battle, these self-described champions betray themselves to be not men, let alone heroes, but whiny schoolboys with no resource but to run wailing to "*Master Louis*, and tell coward tale / How yet the Hollanders do make a noise, / Threaten to beat us, and are naughty still" (428-30). Riebling notes "the domestic panic and greed that geld the military and leave 'our Forts unmann'd' (433)" (144). It is not only the forts that have been unmanned, but the nation itself, whose leaders are not men but, at best, powerless boys. The manhood of the English leadership is again shown to be inadequate when the enemy Dutch in 1667 sail freely in English waters:[30]

> Ruyter the while, that had our ocean curbed,
> Sailed now among our rivers undisturbed,
> Surveyed their crystal streams and banks so green
> And beauties ere this never naked seen.

7

---

[30] "On 10 June Sheerness fort was captured and a force raided the Isle of Sheppey. Although Chatham docks were defended by a chain stretched across the Medway and by sunken ships and guardships, the Dutch broke through, set on fire six warships and towed away two others including the *Royal Charles* on which the King had first arrived in England. Panic was terrific and the blame was laid squarely on the King and his Ministers" (Ashley 147).

Through the vain sedge, the bashful nymphs he eyed:
Bosoms, and all which from themselves they hide. (523-8)

The explicitly sexualised language makes it clear that the self-styled modern English heroes cannot even protect their feminised land from the peering eyes of the invader, let alone from more terrible violation. Moreover, the more manly Dutch evince an appropriately manly response to these alluring sights, one of which these tattling English boys seem incapable: "He finds the air and all things sweeter here. / The sudden change, and such a tempting sight / Swells his old veins with fresh blood, fresh delight" (530-3). Commanded by such noisy but impotent leaders, it is no wonder, then, that the English compare so badly with the heroes of other times and other nations: "Where Venice twenty years the Turk had fought, / While the first year our navy is but shown, / The next divided, and the third we've none" (402-5).

It is one of these violated nymphs, unprotected by the English heroes with whom she should have been safe , who appears to the king near the end of the poem, pleading silently for succour:

There, as in the calm horror all alone
He wakes, and muses of th' uneasy throne;
Raise up a sudden shape with virgin's face,
(Though ill agree her posture, hour, or place),
Naked as born, and her round arms behind
With her own tresses, interwove and twined;
Her mouth locked up, a blind before her eyes,

Yet from beneath the veil her blushes rise,
And silent tears her secret anguish speak;
Her heart throbs and with very shame would break. (889-98)

Charles's first response to this vision of violation, inappropriately but unsurprisingly enough, is amorous:

The object strange in him no terror moved:
He wondered first, then pitied, then he loved,
And with kind hand does the coy vision press
(Whose beauty greater seemed by her distress),
But soon shrunk back, chilled with her touch so cold,
And th' airy picture vanished from his hold. (899-904)

As Riebling notes of this segment, "There are two reactions a man can have to a rape victim: empathetic outrage or pornographic arousal. It should not surprise the reader that Charles's reaction is the latter" (151). His response may be unsurprising, but it is highly discreditable to the leader and chief protector of the nation.

The poem proper concludes with Charles resolved to take action against Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, the Lord Chancellor, who resigned the seals on 30 Augus 1667, and fled to France on 29 November (after Marvell's poem was written).[31] But the efficacy of action against Clarendon in addressing the weakness of the nation is questionable, since Charles is surrounded by cowardice and treachery against which he takes no action at all:

> Through their feigned speech their secret hearts he knew:
> To her own husband, Castlemaine untrue;
> False to his master Bristol, Arlington;
> And Coventry, falser than anyone,
> Who to the brother, brother would betray,
> Nor therefore trusts himself to such as they.
> His father's ghost, too, whispered him one note,
> That who does cut his purse will cut his throat,
> But in wise anger he their crimes forbears,
> As thieves reprieved for executioners. (931-40)

Hemmed in by political limitations and treachery, constrained by his need for funds, Charles punishes one, but pardons the many, and therefore leaves unaddressed the false, deluded, dangerous heroism that has brought the nation to this sorry pass.

---

[31] The parliamentary criticism of Clarendon that led to his downfall focussed on military concerns: "The poor results of the war demanded a scapegoat and the obvious victim was the Earl of Clarendon. Clarendon was regarded as the chief Minister and as such was held responsible for the disasters. He was . . . believed to have encouraged the King to raise a standing army" (Ashley 148). Of course, other factors played a role in his fall, too; he had been a counsellor to the King since Charles was very young, and continued to speak to the monarch as he had to the boy, criticising his behaviour and condemning his excesses, something Charles increasingly resented (Ashley 149-150, 152-3). And allowing Clarendon to take the blame for failures for which others were at least as culpable prevented that blame from being "extended to himself [Charles] and his Ministry in general. . . . Thus from the King's point of view it was convenient if the parliamentary assaults concentrated on one target--Clarendon" (Ashley 149).

The poem does describe one real hero fighting for the English: Archibald Douglas, "brave *Douglas*," as the poem names him (649). He faces the foe heroically and is himself so courageous that he is unable to fathom the cowardice that allows others to flee: "Fixed on his ship, he faced that horrid day / And wondered much at those that run away. / Nor other fear himself could comprehend . . ." (661-3). His death is described in terms suitably heroic and impressive:

> His shape exact, which the bright flames enfold,
> Like the sun's statue stands of burnished gold.
> Round the transparent fire about him glows,
> As the clear amber on the bee does close,
> And, as on angels' heads their glories shine,
> His burning locks adorn his face divine. (679-84)

The naked nymphs who were spied upon and violated by the Dutch, who appealed to the King for help only to meet with another attempted violation, long for the more desirable Douglas's embraces:

> Oft, as he in chill Esk or Seine[32] by night
> Hardened and cooled his limbs, so soft, so white,
> Among the reeds, to be espied by him,
> The nymphs would rustle; he would forward swim.

---

[32] Like so many Scots before and after him, Douglas had earlier commanded a company for the French.

> They sighed and said, "Fond boy, why so untame
> That fliest love's fires, reserved for other flame?" (655-60)

A hero he may be, but his heroism is unable to achieve anything of note except death; he refuses to save himself, although he might, and exults in his own destruction:

> That precious life he yet disdains to save
> Or with known art to try the gentle wave.
> Much him the honours of his ancient race
> Inspire, nor would he his own deeds deface,
> And secret joy in his calm soul does rise
> That Monck looks on to see how Douglas dies. (671-6)

Of what use is a heroism that brings little or no aid to the living, the poet seems to suggest, and refuses even to sustain itself in life? That Douglas, however heroic, is not presented to us as a model of heroic English manhood or a site of unmixed adulation is made clear by two factors: his nationality and his ambiguous masculinity.

Surprisingly, some critics have read Douglas as a wholly admirable figure in this poem, an exemplary hero unproblematically presented as worthy of emulation. Joseph Messina calls Douglas "the superior human being against whom many other characters and their actions are measured" (297); Marvell's depictions of false, delusory heroism, Messina argues, "help to define the hero of the poem by contrasting him with inferior images. The Douglas episode of course presents the thing itself, the heroic character that Marvell holds up for emulation" (300). Barbara Riebling also unconvincingly reads Marvell's lines about Douglas as laudatory: "The account of Douglas's sacrifice has a genuine sweetness that also makes it inharmonious with satire. . . . When the young Scot marries Death, it is an innocent as well as honourable union" (148). Although she acknowledges that the segment's "lascivious tone is deeply disturbing to the conventional comforts of elegiac verse" (148), she regards the sexualised language as "strategic, presenting patriotism and courage as fiery passions one can experience without shame. . . . Marvell's poem raises erotic energy to fuel a transcendent impulse, grasping his readers by the libido to lead them to the love of honor" (149). But these readings ignore or underestimate the many elements of the poem that undermine any notion of Douglas as straightforwardly heroic, let alone a model for emulation by Englishmen aspiring to the heights of heroic masculinity.

Archibald Douglas is, of course, not English, but Scottish, and if his name were not enough to signal that fact, the poet drives the point home in the last line--indeed, in the last word, emphasised by its position, its use as the concluding rhyme of a couplet, and by the primary stress that falls on it--of his 47-line description of Douglas: "Our English youth shall sing the valiant Scot" (696). With no English heroes to turn to, young Englishmen looking for models of heroic masculinity must turn to a Scot (a sad state of affairs, surely), and to one, moreover, whose masculinity has been put into serious doubt by the preceding lines of the poem. Consider the surprising first lines describing Douglas, "on whose lovely chin / The early down but newly did begin, / And modest beauty yet his sex did veil, / While envious virgins hope he is a male" (649-52). Surely the maleness of a martial hero should be more obvious than this? But Douglas, this brave hero, the only hero available to the English in this poem, flees from the importunities of the amorous nymphs--so actively, albeit offensively, sought by the King and the Dutch--to battle, where he embraces death as a substitute for the more frightening touch of a woman: "Like a glad lover, the fierce flames he meets, / And tries his first embraces in their sheets" (677-8). In portraying Douglas as a frightened virgin, Marvell departs from fact: Douglas was actually married (Messina 302). This significant alteration of the facts of his subject's life underlines Marvell's intention in this segment of the poem to render doubtful Douglas's masculinity. Whereas Douglas had earlier fled from the arms of the importuning nymphs to the safer environment of a naval battle, he now meets the embrace of death with relief:

> But when in his immortal mind he felt
> His altering form and soldered limbs to melt,
> Down on the deck he laid himself and died,
> With his dear sword reposing by his side,
> And on the flaming plank, so rests his head
> As one that's warmed himself and gone to bed. (685-90)

His sexual panic has driven him from the frightening but life-giving arms of the nymphs to the comfort of his sterile and death-giving military arms. And this is the only hero the poet identifies for "our English youth" to sing. Marvell has blown apart the triad of heroic English masculinity.

Marvell is not the only writer of the Restoration and later seventeenth century to grapple with or undercut Dryden's heroics. As Claude Rawson has noted, the "epic impulse, adulterated by romance elements and generally coarsened, was diverted, by Dryden and others, into the heroic play, a genre which was quickly seen by many as a further example of the failure of the heroic mode to animate genuinely good writing" ("Pope's Waste Land" 48). George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, and his collaborators mocked the conventions of heroic drama and Dryden as their chief spokesman and practitioner in *The Rehearsal* (1671). An earlier version of the play featured a playwright named Bilboa, apparently modelled on Sir Robert Howard, a friend of Dryden's,[33] but the closure of the theatres upon the outbreak of the plague prevented its production until long after shifting political allegiances made Buckingham and Howard allies rather than enemies (Winn 178-9). By 1671 Dryden was both poet laureate and the most successful playwright of the day, as well as an enemy to both Howard and Buckingham. The playwright Bayes, the centre of the rewritten satire, is clearly modelled on Dryden, who, as poet laureate, "wore the official bays of English poetry" (Elias 178). But, as Richard Elias points out, the authors of *The Rehearsal* were attacking not just Dryden personally, but also the genre he so prominently defended and practised (178-9). Winn correctly calls *The Rehearsal* "a carefully crafted, brilliantly effective attack on the theatrical conventions of heroic drama" (230). In it heroism is largely a matter of bombast and rant, more concerned with immediate and sensational effects than with any kind of dramatic coherence, as at the beginning of the third act when Bayes describes "a Scene of sheer Wit": "You shall see 'em come in upon one another snip snap, hit for hit, as fast as can be. First one speaks, then presently t'others upon him, slap with a Repartee; then he at him again, dash with a new conceipt; and so eternally, eternally, I gad, till they go quite off the Stage" (III.i.8-16). Tiresome bombast thus takes precedence over coherent action. At one point, two soldiers enter, engage in some preposterously flatfooted dialogue, and kill one another. "Now here's an odd surprize," Bayes comments excitedly to Smith and Johnson (the two outside observers of the rehearsal of Bayes's new play), "all these dead men you shall see rise up presently, at a certain Note that I have made, in *Effaut flat*, and fall a Dancing" (II.v. 7-9). The actors complain that they cannot keep time to the music Bayes has composed for their rising from the dead (one would think that the incomprehensibility of the action would be a more immediate cause of complaint), and Bayes--demonstrating the effect he wishes to create--falls down and breaks his nose. Bayes's reason for his ridiculous stage direction is simply that it is his "Fancy, in this Play, . . . to end every Act with a Dance" (III.i.2-3). Smith's reaction to the absurdities of the play is blunt: "'Sdeath, this would make a man spew" (II.ii.10).

---

[33] Dryden had written a prefatory poem to Sir Robert's *Poems* in 1660. See Dryden's *Poems* I.30-35. By 1671 their friendship was over and had been replaced by a very public enmity. In addition to Howard, Sir William Davenant is also generally considered a target in this earlier version of *The Rehearsal* (Crane vii-viii; Winn 231).

The Rehearsal was enormously popular. A modern editor of the play notes that "nearly three hundred performances have been recorded between 1671 and 1777"; it "both established dramatic burlesque as a major type until well into the eighteenth century, and set the pattern for most of it" (Crane x). Although its mockery did not immediately drive heroic drama from the stage,[34] "the name 'Bayes' stuck with [Dryden] throughout his career" (Elias 178).

The revision of Dryden's heroics continues throughout the later seventeenth century. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester "devastated the theoretical postulates of heroism cherished by Dryden and other stay-at-home devisers of 'heroic' couplets, stanzas, and dramas" (J.W. Johnson 28). In "A Satyr Against Mankind" he separates heroism from military action completely, and attributes the martial impulse not to any nobility in man's nature but instead to his essential frailty and cowardice:

> Be judge yourself, I'll bring it to the test
> Which is the basest creature, man or beast? . . .
> For hunger or for love they bite and tear,
> Whilst wretched man is still in arms for fear.
> For fear he arms and is of arms afraid,
> From fear to fear successively betrayed,

---

[34] "Dryden's last play of this type was *Aureng-Zebe* in 1675, and the heroic vogue that is generally considered to have had its origin in Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* did not come to an end until some years after *The Rehearsal*, about 1677. Clearly, heroic drama and the satire upon it were both acceptable" (Crane xi).

> Base fear, the source whence his best actions came,
> His boasted honour and his dear-bought fame,
> The lust of power to which he's such a slave
> And for the which alone he dares be brave. . . . (127-8, 139-46)

Heroic action is rooted in fear and weakness, not in courage and strength:

> The good he acts, the ill he does endure,
> 'Tis all from fear, to make himself secure.
> Merely for safety, after fame they thirst,
> For all men would be cowards if they durst. . . . (155-8)

Heroism viewed from such a vantage point is neither a trait of masculinity to be admired and emulated nor a source of trustworthy leadership for the nation.

All of these attacks on the concept of militarily-derived heroic masculinity were made against the background of a deep-rooted antimilitarism that historian Lois G. Schwoerer argues gained strength in England during the troubled years of the seventeenth century, and culminated in the resistance to a peacetime standing army that reached a climax in the late 1690s. "Long before a standing army was created in England, a predisposition to distrust the paid, professional soldier was discernible," Schwoerer asserts (8). She attributes this deep-rooted antimilitarism not to pacifism or Christian idealism (8), but principally to four factors. First is geography:

> Surrounded by water and protected by her navy, of which

> almost everyone approved,[35] the country enjoyed a sense of psychological security, which neither conquest, threat, naval disaster, nor foreign landing diminished. Examples could be readily produced to show that geography has been endlessly used to justify the idea that the nation should not depend upon a large, permanent military establishment. For example, an English pamphleteer wrote in 1579 that if the country were not an island, men would "know and value the soldier and lick the dust off the feete" of an army. (Schwoerer 10)

Second, "the character of the foot soldiers with whom Englishmen had had experience" encouraged antimilitary sentiments (Schwoerer 10). Both under Elizabeth and under the early Stuarts, "men from the lowest reaches of society were pressed into service to form the armies that were sent abroad,"[36] and disbanded soldiers caused troubles when the wars were over. The difficulty of providing work for disbanded soldiers and their tendency to continue habits of behaviour learned during military service created much concern; M.S. Anderson, for example, notes that infrequent and often long-delayed pay forced soldiers regularly to engage in plunder during their period of military service,[37] and accustomed them to continued thievery after they were discharged (54-5). Derek Jarrett notes that even as late as the mid-eighteenth century, "most Englishmen considered that there were only two possible reasons for a man becoming a soldier: either because he was forced to, or because he was so poor and destitute that he had no other choice" (38). "The character of the soldiers, the cost of providing for them, and the importunities of the central government," Schwoerer notes, "did nothing to recommend to country gentlemen the idea of creating a permanent, professional corps" (10-11). A permanent military force would ensure, opponents thought, that such depredations and annoyances would be permanent, as well.

---

[35] Attitudes towards the navy were always more positive in England than they were towards a land army, in contrast to the situation on the Continent: "While in England the importance of naval power was a virtually incontestable shibboleth, in both France and the United Provinces the navy was something of a political football, likely to be kicked by its adversaries out of play. Such a role was reserved in England for the army" (Brewer 33). Wilfrid Prest notes that "as an institution the Royal Navy enjoyed far greater popularity and prestige than the army. The redcoats were still widely regarded with a mixture of fear and loathing which went back to Cromwellian days, reinforced by the plausible neo-Harringtonian, Country, and Tory view that a standing army was always a potential threat to the subjects' liberties. Such objections could hardly be levelled at the navy, which was indeed widely recognized as the country's main defence against foreign invasion, as well as the guardian of its burgeoning overseas commerce" (88). As Christopher Hill points out, the crown in the early seventeeth century, lacking a standing army, "could only act in agree ment with the gentry who ruled the localities. A navy is no use for internal repression" (*The Century of Revolution* 61).

---

[36] Although impressment was chiefly used to forcibly recruit men for service in the navy, and was legal for such purposes, it was used as well at times for recruitment into land armies: "During the civil war. . . , both sides pressed men energetically into service in the areas they controlled. In March 1644, for example, the royalist parliament in Oxford voted the immediate raising in this way of 6000 recruits to strengthen its field army" (M.S. Anderson 50). Coercive recruitment methods were common in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: "Farquhar's expansive Sergeant Kite is a far more benevolent figure than the real-life Michael Tooley, provost-marshal of the Coldstream Guards, who in the early 1690s was detaining up to 200 unfortunate 'volunteers' at a time in his London crimping house, before shipping them off to Flanders. Besides convicted felons and debtors, from 1704 JPs were authorized to conscript all able-bodied men without 'any lawful calling or employment' as soldiers, so long as they lacked the vote (and hence could be regarded as both socially and politically expendable)" (Prest 87). As M.S. Anderson notes, "every attempt to raise men by compulsion was unpopular. All of them produced strenuous efforts to avoid service, which were reflected in high rates of desertion. All of them opened a wide field to corruption of various kinds" (50). All added fuel to the fire of antimilitaristic attitudes in England, as well.

[37] Plunder was a long-recognised perquisite of victorious troops and often the chief source of their financial rewards for service.

Third among Schwoerer's proffered reasons for deep-rooted antimilitaristic sentiments in England is "the lack of genuine leadership from the center of government in establishing a permanent force" (11). Both Elizabeth I and James I failed to push for a standing army partly because "neither could have paid for an army from his [or her] own resources nor could have expected a grant from Parliament for such a purpose" (Schwoerer 12).[*] Forced to rely on "a poorly-armed and and poorly-trained local militia, a tiny personal bodyguard, and in emergencies a rallying of the traditional forces of the magnates and their retainers, tenants, and servants," the Tudor and Stuart monarchs "were in no position to mount a large-scale offensive against internal rebels without voluntary military support from [their] own subjects" (Stone 62). They were unable to mount an effective defence--or offence, for that matter--against external foes, either, without strong and continuing Parliamentary support, often dearly and frustratingly bought, a situation that was to hamper the conduct of the war against Louis XIV under the leadership of both William III and Marlborough.

---

[*] Of course, Charles I's shortage of money and subsequent need for funds from Parliament to pay for military expenses contributed largely to the outbreak of civil war in the 1640s. See Lawrence Stone's *The Causes of the English Revolution*, especially 60-62, 122-4, and 135-8, and Christopher Hill's *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, especially chapter 3, "Economics" (11-35), and chapter 4, "Politics and the Constitution" (36-62).

Finally, Schwoerer argues, unlike continental states, "England had preserved her ancient system of military organization and obligation without fundamental change until 1645" (12). Unlike France, where a standing army specifically employed by the king had been established in 1445 (Braudy 87, 98), "the English system," Schwoerer points out, "contained neither customary nor statutory place for a standing army" (12). Opponents to a standing army could appeal to tradition and precedent. Schwoerer quotes a tract of 1648 arguing against permanent status for the New Model Army: "If there were no other argument against it, it is enough that it is a thing was never used in this Kingdome" (13). Antimilitaristic attitudes, rooted in such factors as Schoewerer identifies, strengthened through the Civil War years and the Interregnum. "In England," another historian notes, "experience in 1655-7 of the system of rule by major-generals, based on a 'new militia' which was in some ways very close to a standing army, had given more strength to already strong anti-militarist feeling" (M.S. Anderson 85). Cromwell's army was quickly dissolved after the Restoration:

> Internal security was the top priority for Charles and the government-in-exile which returned with him. Even if the political loyalty of the armed forces could have been relied upon, which it most definitely could not, the financial case for demobilization was overwhelming. Indeed the

> prospect of relief from taxes levied to support the New Model Army provided in itself a powerful argument for monarchy. Considering the fate of previous attempts to downsize or disband the military, the process went surprisingly smoothly. (Prest 36)

Charles retained only a small force of just over three thousand troops: "For the time being this personal force could be plausibly represented as a prudent insurance against assassination attempts. Only later did it come to be viewed as a sinister move towards a standing army, poised to overthrow the law and liberties of England" (Prest 37).

Indeed, as relations between Parliament and King worsened again after the euphoria of the Restoration, the military became and remained a point of contention. Even after the humiliating disaster of the Dutch attack on the Medway in 1667, Parliament objected to the King's raising new regiments, "since they might be employed as a standing army in peace time" (Ashley 148). Charles declared war again on the Dutch in 1672 without the approval of Parliament; he did not call them until the need for funds to prosecute the war forced him to in February 1673, and their intransigence at that time brought the Second Dutch War to a speedy close and provoked a petition from the Commons against a standing army (Ashley 198). The continuing, tangled connections between the English King and Court and the French, the "complexity and duplicity of Charles II's foreign policy" (Schwoerer 118), added to the Duke of York's conversion to

Catholicism, exacerbated the situation throughout the 1670s and into the 1680s.[39] After James II came to the throne, his arrogant tactlessness and policy of staffing the army with Catholic officers, in violation of the Test Act, aroused bitter opposition; throughout his brief reign, "the army was a highly visible and irritating symbol of power" (Schwoerer 146). Despite sustained Parliamentary opposition, by 1688 the King "had a peacetime military establishment of over fifty-three thousand officers and men. Many of the commands were given to Irish Catholics" (Schwoerer 146), and his Commander-in-Chief was a Frenchman, Feversham, whose Catholicism had assisted his promotion ahead of the militarily more accomplished John Churchill, a staunch Protestant (Churchill I.211). In fact, as Winston Churchill notes, by the end of his reign "King James could marshal as large an army as Oliver Cromwell at his height" (I.293). But he could not retain the loyalty of significant portions of this army, and especially its officers (including, of course, John Churchill), against William of Orange, as "a vast repudiation of allegiance united Englishmen of every rank and party" (Churchill I.296). Despite the almost wholly bloodless nature of the Glorious Revolution, therefore, it was implicated in the continuing English distrust of all things military and a tendency to separate the military role from ideal masculinity.

---

[39] Fears of Catholicism, the French, arbitrary government, and a standing army were inescapably intertwined in England during these years, as shown by a statement by Sir Thomas Meres, a member of the Commons, in 1674: "Our jealousies of Popery or arbitrary government are not for a few inconsiderable Papists here, but from the ill example we have got from France" (qtd by Ashley 211). Opponents of a standing army abhorred the sort of authoritarian absolutism that characterised the French monarchy, and feared anything that seemed to move England closer to that.

The standing army controversy came to its climax in the late 1690s. Stresses had been building during "what is variously and confusingly known as the Nine Years War, King William's War, the War of the Grand Alliance, the War of the League of Augsburg, and the War of the British Succession (1689-97)" (Prest 82). The costs of the war, as of any war, were more than financial, but those were extreme: "Whereas James II's total yearly income had never exceeded £3m., annual military spending alone reached £8.1m. in 1696, and peaked during the following decade at £10.2m." (Prest 83). The pressure came to a head following the Treaty of Ryswick:[40] "The immediate practical question was what to do with King William's large, victorious army. . . . The confrontations in Parliament and press illuminate the continuing struggle for power between the king and the House of Commons" (Schwoerer 155). Opponents of a peacetime standing army could not and did not argue that "William wanted an army to Catholicize the nation or bring England within the French orbit, as had been the case with his predecessors. But William was suspected of holding as high notions about royal prerogative as any Stuart king" (Schwoerer 157).[41] On the contrary, as Schwoerer notes, his "interest, with single-minded intensity, was focused on the vexing problem of Louis XIV's ambition. . . . He was certain that . . . the army reductions were encouraging France to formulate plans she had not even thought of before, that England *must* commit herself to a continental role" (158). But the Parliamentary opposition, led by Robert Harley, argued that a large standing army was unnecessary when England was at peace, that it was prohibitively expensive to maintain, and "that paid soldiers were morally irresponsible and a threat to the sanctity of property" (Schwoerer 162). The ensuing debate in both Parliament and press was noisy and acrimonious, and produced many insults directed at the army and military men (Schwoerer 167). Tempers were high, and public respect for the military low.

---

[40] The Treaty of Ryswick, or Rijswijk, marked the temporary end of hostilities between Louis XIV and those forces ranged against him, led by William III and including England, the United Provinces, and Spain; it was signed in late 1697. Both sides were less than satisfied with the terms of the agreement (van der Zee and van der Zee 429-420), and it broke down under the pressure of renewed French ambitions in Spain and "brazen peace-time occupation of Flanders" in 1701 (van der Zee and van der Zee 463).

John Churchill, therefore, came to prominence against a background of profound distrust of the military virtues and military leaders. Far from being a national hero or exemplar, the military hero was seen and routinely depicted as a threat to the nation and its cherished liberties. The Duke of Marlborough's extraordinary achievements and success as a military leader temporarily overcame the suspicion and hostility towards professional soldiers so common in England, but could not permanently sustain his reputation in the face of England's long history of anti[illegible]itarism and the continuing distrust of military figures and the political uses to which they could be put in the unstable political situation by an unscrupulous or authoritarian monarch with designs on English liberties. Indeed, Marlborough's very success could be used against him, as his detractors, including Jonathan Swift, accused him of a desire to use it to undermine such liberties and establish himself in a position of unassailable, extra-Parliamentary power. The descent into invective and accusationthat characterised representations of him in the last years of his command is therefore less surprising than the panegyric that preceded it. In the light of such bitter denunciations and calumnies and his subsequent fall from power, it is hardly surprising that the heroic should be eclipsed by the satirical and the mock-heroic in the literature of the early eighteenth century

---

[41] Attempts were made by the Court to celebrate William III as a heroic figure for the nation (for example, see Murray G.H. Pittock's *Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 32ff and 101ff) but William as exemplar of national heroism was a hard sell given his unimpressive physical attributes, his foreignness (he was much criticised for his beneficence towards foreign favourites), and his personality. David Daiches echoes popular conceptions of William when he describes him as "a cold fish with nothing at all of what is now called *charisma*" (12). Whatever else an exemplary hero lacks, he must have charisma, that indefinable ability to draw others to him, a quality that both Marlborough and Wellington--despite their very different characters--seem to have had in abundance, as even their detractors acknowledged. Most of those who came into contact with Charles Edward Stuart--Bonnie Prince Charlie--similarly commented on his great charm (see Chapter 4).

Chapter 3

Heroic Masculinity and the Duke of Marlborough:

Inheritance and Change

> *"There are few successful commanders," says Creasy, "on whom Fame has shone so unwillingly as upon John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough." I believe this is true; and it is an interesting historical study to examine the causes which have made so great a contrast between the glory and importance of his deeds and the small regard of his countrymen for his memory.*
>
> *Winston Churchill,* Marlborough: His Life and Times *(I.3)*

The national struggles of the Civil War and its aftermath provide an essential part of the context for Marlborough's rise in the popular imagination to the status of national hero and and for his subsequent fall from political, popular, and military grace. The events of the seventeenth century[42] had left ancient traditions of the warrior hero battered and scarcely viable, but new forms and contexts in which to celebrate heroes had not yet arisen. And the English were not ready to do without heroes entirely; perhaps no people ever is. As Boyd Berry has written, "it is in shaping the lives and conduct of their heroes that men often most fully express the convergence of intellectually held ideology and personal yearning" (377). But where such convergence is lacking or under cultural dispute, as in post-Civil War England, the very concept of the heroic becomes problematic. And so, despite the unquestionably heroic achievements of Marlborough as military leader, beginning with his victory over the French in 1704, his status as hero and exemplar was unstable.

---

[42] The effects of the Civil War on the national consciousness--evident in both politics and literature--lingered long after Marlborough's time. See Chapter 4 for further discussion of the situation in the eighteenth century after Marlborough.

The stunning victory of 13 August 1704 known to posterity as the battle of Blenheim made Marlborough--handsome, elegant, charming, and the author of a great victory against an apparently invincible foe--seem at first the ideal hero. Even partisan quarrelling between Tories and Whigs had to give way before the popular enthusiasm for Marlborough and his triumph:

> Tory politicians found the victory of Blenheim hard to welcome. . . . No doubt the success of the British arms and the allied cause was desirable and even necessary, but the party disadvantages resulting therefrom were obvious. The Tories were therefore torn between their relief and a good deal of uncontrollable pride as Englishmen, and their annoyance as partisans. . . . The Tory chagrin was, however, restrained not only by their patriotism, but by a lively sense of the joy of the nation. (Churchill II.513)

The popular acclaim for Marlborough was indeed tremendous, and it came from "every class of citizen down to the very poorest and most humble, all of whose hearts responded to the feeling that it was *their* victory, that *their* cause had triumphed, and that *their* England was growing great" (Churchill II.517).

Marlborough himself shared in the exultant mood in a letter to Godolphin immediately after the battle: "The victory we obtained yesterday is greater then has been known in the memory of man!" (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I.350).

Why did the battle give rise to such excitement? The immediate fruits of victory were impressive: high enemy losses including at least 12,700 dead, six to seven thousand wounded, and some twelve thousand taken prisoner (Churchill II.467), including the leader of the defeated French forces, Marshal Tallard (humiliating numbers "almost unmatched during this period" [J.R. Jones 97[43]]), the dispelling of "the myth of French military invincibility" (J.R. Jones 96), and the widespread hope--shared by Marlborough himself--that this victory had brought the end of the war in sight. "I think it is plain," he wrote to Godolphin in the spring of 1705, "that France would be glad of a peace, but to have a good one we must pray for God's blessing on her Majesty and her Allyes armes this campagne" (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I.425). The conclusion of the war was not to be achieved so easily, but no one could know that in the closing months of 1704. The long-term effects of the victory would also be tremendous, as Churchill emphasises: "Blenheim is immortal as a battle not only because of the extraordinary severity of the fighting of all the troops on the field all day long, and the overwhelming character of the victory, but because it changed the political axis of the world" (II.478). The victory brought about a permanent and severe diminution of the ambitions of Louis XIV:

---

[43] Other scholars have offered higher numbers, while noting similar consequences: "The immediate practical effect [of the victory] was the occupation of Bavaria by the Allies, but even more important was the moral effect produced by the surrender of 14,000 of Louis's invincible troops" (Wheeler xxii).

> Although long years of bloodshed lay before him, his object henceforward was only to find a convenient and dignified exit from the arena in which he had so long stalked triumphant. His ambition was no longer to gain a glorious dominion, but only to preserve the usurpations which he regarded as his lawful rights, and in the end this again was to shrink to no more than a desperate resolve to preserve the bedrock of France. (Churchill II.479)

It was to be another century before French ambitions were to rise above this demoralising defeat. The victory "saved the Hapsburg Empire, and thereby preserved the grand alliance from collapse" (Barnett 122). The balance of power in Europe shifted, with French influence decreasing and English power and influence notably increasing. Also, although the victory did not erase the threat of Jacobitism, it significantly diminished it. "On the field of Blenheim also sank the fortunes of the House of Stuart," Churchill asserts (II.479). Perhaps they did, but English fears of insurrection and instability fostered by memories of the Civil War and the later Jacobite rebellions took much longer to subside.

The battle took place on 13 August 1704, and the poetic effusions celebrating it began almost immediately thereafter as poets, and their patrons, vied with one another as to who would sing the Duke's praises most loudly, in hopes that their efforts would earn them the recognition of those in power.[44] Of the poems to be considered here, Matthew Prior's is the earliest; his "Letter to Monsieur Boileau Despreaux; Occasion'd by the Victory at Blenheim" appeared in September, the month in which Queen Anne called for a national thanksgiving for the victory (David Green 126). Dismayed by the generally poor quality of the commemorative poems that were appearing in such quantity during these months, Godolphin and Halifax sent Henry Boyle, Chancellor of the Exchequer, to ask Joseph Addison if he would attempt his own poem for the occasion (Johnson, *Lives* I.404). *The Campaign* appeared in December and enjoyed considerable success. Samuel Johnson considered it "confessedly the best performance" of any of those celebrating the victory (Johnson, *Lives* I.430). In early January, soon after Marlborough's triumphant arrival in England, two more noteworthy contributions appeared: John Philips's *Bleinheim* and John Oldmixon's *A Pastoral Poem on the Victories at Schellenburgh and Bleinheim.*

The description, first offered by Dr. Warton, of Addison's *The Campaign* as "simply a *Gazette* done into tolerable rhyme" (qtd by Gilfillan xxiii; see also Johnson, *Lives* I.429-30) would apply equally well or better to parts of Prior's "Letter to Monsieur Boileau Despreaux":

---

[44] Of this mass of material, John Baird considers only Addison's *The Campaign* and John Philips's *Bleinheim* to have "more than ephemeral appeal to readers" (163), but a consideration of more than these seems necessary to give a fuller flavour of the poetic discourse surrounding the victory and its leader.

In one great Day on HOCHSTET's[45] fatal Plain
FRENCH and BAVARIANS twenty thousand slain;
Push'd thro' the DANUBE to the Shoars of STYX
Squadrons eighteen, Battalions twenty-six:
Officers Captive made and private Men,
Of these twelve hundred, of those thousands ten.
Tents, Ammunition, Colours, Carriages,
Cannons, and Kettle-Drums--sweet numbers these. (55-62)

Prior immediately admits that such a style, which he calls "a Comissary's List in Verse" (66), is inadequate to his subject, but despairs of finding a style more suitable: "So vast, so numerous were great BLENHEIM's spoils, / They scorn the Bounds of Verse, and mock the Muse's Toils" (69-70). He acknowledges a difficulty in marrying the form and content of heroic narrative verse of this sort that would have puzzled earlier writers; as Frances Mayhew Rippy notes of this and other poems of the period, "accounts of Marlborough's exploits are punctuated by complaints on the difficulties of writing panegyrics" (53):

'Tis mighty hard: what Poet would essay
To count the Streamers of my Lord Mayor's Day?
To number all the several Dishes drest
By honest LAMB, last Coronation Feast?

---

[45] In the first months after the victory, it was as often called the battle of Höchstädt (variously spelled) as that of Blenheim, Höchstädt and Blenheim (Blindheim) being neighbouring villages between and around which the battle was fought.

Or make Arithmetic and Epic meet;

And NEWTON's Thoughts in DRYDEN's Stile repeat? (73-9)

"He is implying," Rippy argues, "that panegyric verse, seeing the world in terms of black and white, evil and good, is the business of younger men, with less knowledge of the world as it is" (53); only the naïve and unsophisticated, in other words, can still engage unproblematically with the genre.

Fir'd with the Thoughts which these Ideas [i.e. of British glory] raise,
And great Ambition of my Country's Praise;
The ENGLISH muse should like the MANTUAN rise,
Scornful of Earth and Clouds, should reach the Skies,
With Wonder (tho' with Envy still) pursu'd by Human Eyes.

But We must change the Style. (177-82)

The poem therefore becomes in part a metapoetic discussion of the impossibility in the contemporary world of writing such a poem.

Michael Murrin traces such disjunctions between literary traditions and military practice to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (38); earlier writers of heroic narrative had recognised few such difficulties.[46] Within the English context, Prior's acknowedgement of difficulty in marrying the content of modern heroic narrative verse with its form is perhaps also an early symptom of what John Sitter has called "the flight from history" in eighteenth-century poetry (412). Sitter focuses on the period after 1740, when, "whether by decision or default, . . . most of the younger poets avoid direct historical treatment of the events of their day, even of their century" (Sitter 416). While this is certainly not true of the period presently under consideration, as the eagerness of poets to commemorate Blenheim testifies, nevertheless the difficulty Prior and others experience in treating contemporary history in verse perhaps provides a clue to the reasons why later poets were to avoid such subject matter altogether.

---

[46] As argued in Chapter 1, suggestions of a gap between the theory and the practice of martial masculinity were already making themselves felt as early as the later middle ages. Later developments in England, especially the Civil War, exacerbated the gap and strengthened its importance. Michael Murrin usefully discusses the effect of changing practices of warfare on traditional representations of it in *History and Warfare in Renaissance Epic* (1994).

Still, whatever his struggles to make form and content agree, Prior, like so many other poets of the period, was determined to make his poem pleasing to those in power. That the work was intended to serve a political purpose is clear from a diary entry:

> [U]pon the great victory of Hockstadt [i.e. Blenheim] I thought I had a fair occasion to shew the real respect I had for my Lord [Marlborough], . . . upon which I wrote my letter to Mons^r^ Boileau, and as soon as it was printed sent 2 Copyes of it with a very civil letter to my Lady Dutchesse desiring her to do Me the honour to give one of those copyes to the Queen. (qtd by Wright and Spears II.893)

The effort was, however, unsuccessful, for the Duchess of Marlborough sent the packet back unopened, "declaring that she would not receive anything of my writing" (qtd by Wright and Spears II.893). H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears, modern editors of Prior's literary works, note that the Duchess's "persistent enmity towards P[rior]" seems to have arisen from her conviction that he had written a satirical poem entitled "Faction Display'd" earlier that same year that mocked the Duke and Duchess, among other Whig adherents (II.797).[47]

Despite the fact that the poem was written at least in part to curry the favour of the powerful, Prior opens it by insisting on the freedom of English poets in contrast to the constraints under which French poets must operate:

> Since hir'd for Life, thy Servile Muse must sing
> Successive Conquests, and a glorious King;
> Must of a Man Immortal vainly boast;
> And bring him Lawrels, whatsoe'er they cost:
> What Turn wilt Thou employ, what Colours
> On the Event of that Superior day,
> In which one ENGLISH Subject's prosp'rous Hand
> (So JOVE did will; so ANNA did command:)
> Broke the proud column of thy Master's Praise,
> Which sixty Winters had conspir'd to raise? (1-10)

Linda Colley has noted that "an extraordinarily large number of Britons" in the early eighteenth century "seem to have believed that, under God, they were peculiarly free and peculiarly prosperous" (32). Further, comparisons with

---

[47] See also Albert Rosenberg's "Prior's Feud with the Duchess of Marlborough" (1953).

France were frequently used to underscore this sense of specialness:

> Particularly in the first half of the eighteenth century, this way of seeing France enabled the British to exorcise some of the deep insecurity they felt in the face of its military might and cultural splendour. Asserting that the millions of Frenchmen massed against them on the other side of the Channel were in reality impoverished, downtrodden, credulous, even somehow unmanly, was a panacea for nagging anxieties and a way of coping with envy. (Colley 35)

Since Blenheim represented the first major victory over the French in the current struggle and therefore contributed, as noted above, to dispelling the myth of French military invincibility, it is hardly surprising that it should have given rise to such widespread rejoicing, nor that its commander should be celebrated as a virtually faultless hero and paragon of all the virtues. The writers of prose were as fulsome in their praises as any poet could be. "In the eyes of the eulogy writers his faultlessness approached the immaculate," as one historian has written (Verney 173). The words of a writer in the *Monthly Mercury* will serve to indicate the extent of the adulation offered in the press:

> His own example gives a particular Life to his Orders; and as no indecent Expression, unbecoming, unclean, or unhandsome Language ever drops from his Lips, so he is imitated by the genteel part of his Army . . . as our great

> Commander is known to the World, or at least to the greatest part of it, to be Temperate, Sober, Careful, Couragious, Politick, Skilful, so is he Courteous, Mild, Affable, Humble, and Condescending to People of the meanest Condition. (qtd by Verney 173)

Such a description, with its long list of capitalised virtues, moves the Duke of Marlborough to the level of allegory. He becomes the embodiment of English manhood, a living contrast to the inadequacies of other nations, especially of France.

Addison's contribution to the poetic commemoration of Blenheim, *The Campaign*, was published on 14 December, the very day that the victorious Duke landed in England.[48] The opening lines of the poem seem to anticipate the representation of Marlborough as a hero worthy of Homeric epic, speaking of "[a]n Iliad rising out of one campaign" (12). As John Baird notes, the implication is that "this one year of Marlborough's generalship is equivalent to the ten-year Trojan War" (172). But Marlborough is more than heroic in this poem: he is divine. He is "our godlike leader" (63), creator rather than mere conqueror of the lands through which he moves:

> The long laborious march he first surveys,
> And joins the distant Danube to the Maese,

---

[48] Daniel Defoe, for one, resented the inside knowledge and political patronage and "careful puffing" that enabled Addison to do so, and that helped ensure the poem's success (Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe* 149).

Between whose floods such pathless forests grow,
Such mountains rise, so many rivers flow:
The toil looks lovely in the hero's eyes. (67-71)

The syntax of this sentence seems to indicate that it is Marlborough's gaze that causes the forests to grow, the mountains to rise, the rivers to join and flow. The final line, echoing as it does the creation story in the book of Genesis ("And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was* very good" [Genesis 1:31]) reinforces the impression.

The images of divinity continue to proliferate. Marlborough is Christ presiding over the Last Judgment; his wrath causes fires to rage, villages to burn, and bleating flocks to flee (223-32), during which chaos he stands apart, grieved to see such suffering: "The leader grieves, by generous pity swayed, / To see his just commands so well obeyed" (237-8). He is omnipresent, much to the terror of his enemies: "The few surviving foes dispersed in flight, / (Refuse of swords, and gleanings of a fight,) /In every rustling wind the victor hear, / And Marlborough's form in every shadow fear" (191-4).

Perhaps the most famous image in *The Campaign* is that of the angel:

So when an angel by divine command
With rising tempests shakes a guilty land,
Such as of late o'er pale Britannia Passed,
Calm and serene he drives the furious blast;
And, pleased the Almighty's orders to perform,
Rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm. (287-92).

Of this passage Samuel Johnson writes,

> No passage in the Campaign has been more often mentioned than the simile of the Angel, which is said in the *Tatler*[49] to be *one of the noblest thoughts that ever entered into the heart of man*, and is therefore worthy of attentive consideration. (*Lives* I.430)

Although Johnson concludes that the figure of speech used is not a simile, but "a mere exemplification," he nevertheless considers the lines "just and noble" though redundant and not well-integrated into the poem (*Lives* I.430-31). This image, by making of Marlborough a deputy of divinity rather than investing him with divinity himself, may seem more modest than the earlier images already discussed. The final line quoted, however, gives the game away. In the Old Testament the image of the whirlwind is consistently associated with Jehovah himself. Consider, for example, this passage from the book of Isaiah:

> For, behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many. (Isaiah 66:15-16)

This recalls the passage in Addison's poem describing the ravaging of the land (lines 223-38) discussed above. An even closer parallel is to be found in the book of Nahum: "The Lord *is* slow to anger, and great in power, and will not at all acquit *the wicked:* the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds *are* the dust of his feet" (Nahum 1:3). Thus, even as the poet declares Marlborough to be merely the deputy of God (as he is the deputy of the Queen), his language invests him yet again with divinity. Further, he contrasts the true divinity of Marlborough with the false, fictional divinity of the French king, who sees his "work of ages sunk in one campaign, / And lives of millions sacrificed in vain" (449-50). The closing lines of the poem make the contrast between the divine hero and the false Sun King explicit:

---

[49] No. 43.

> Fiction may deck the truth with spurious rays,
> And round the hero cast a borrowed blaze.
> Marlborough's exploits appear divinely bright,
> And proudly shine in their own native light. (471-4)

Addison thus attempts to circumvent the difficulties described by Prior in finding the form appropriate to the celebration of a modern hero by turning to the language of divinity. He then attempts to cover up his extravagancies by claiming that he writes no more than literal truth in his description of Marlborough's accomplishments: "Raised of themselves, their genuine charms they boast, / And those who paint them truest praise them most" (475-6).

John Philips's contribution to the public celebration is *Bleinheim*, published on 3 January 1704/5, and commissioned by Harley (to whom it is dedicated) and St. John "to match Addison's *The Campaign* and to show that the Tories were just as patriotic as the Whigs" (Griffin 49).[50] As M.G. Lloyd Thomas writes in his introduction to the only modern edition of Philips's poems, "the moderate Tories, whatever their true feelings may have been, knew that it was useless at that time to attempt to check the popular enthusiasm for Marlborough; the best thing that they could do in the circumstances was to join in it" (xxii). Although it earned Philips "the payment of £100 royal bounty" (Foxon I.570), the poem was not generally considered an artistic success. Philips himself reportedly said to a friend, "I could not help it, Mr. Secretary Harley made me write it--but God forgive him; then, after some pause--& God forgive me also" (qtd by Thomas xxii). Samuel Johnson allows it to be "tolerable," but says that it is

> the poem of a scholar, *all inexpert of war*; of a man who writes books from books, and studies the world in a college. He seems to have formed his ideas of the field of *Blenheim* from the battles of the heroick ages, or the tales of chivalry, with very little comprehension of the qualities necessary to the composition of a modern hero. . . . (*Lives* I.223)

The problem Johnson identifies is exactly that described by Prior in his "Letter to

---

[50] John Baird convincingly demonstrates that "the dates of publication make it difficult to accept [the] received opinion that Philips was engaged only after Addison's poem had appeared" (164) , and therefore "the notion of *The Campaign* as the prior Whig poem and *Bleinheim* as the subsequent Tory rejoinder to it is untenable and needs to be replaced" (165), although he does consider it useful to treat them as a pair (163). That they were published less than three weeks apart (Addison's on 14 December, as noted above, and Philips' on 3 January) and that both were clearly "governmentally-sponsored" efforts (Baird 165) justifies considering them as related texts.

Monsieur Boileau": how to adapt the traditional forms of heroic poetry to the needs of contemporary events.

Philips chooses as his primary model John Milton, particularly the sixth book of *Paradise Lost* describing the war in heaven. Dustin Griffin has established the parallels: the good angels are the English people, God the Father is Queen Anne, Christ is Marlborough, and the fallen angels are the French (449). The fit between the poem and its model is awkward and sometimes absurd, for the poem "ostensibly describes not a mythical war in heaven, but a campaign fought on a European battlefield some months prior to the poem's first publication" (Griffin 449-50). Whereas Addison, whatever extravagancies he committed in his praises of Marlborough, never forgot that his hero was mortal, even begging him to "forbear / To brave the thickest terrors of the war, / Nor hazard thus, confused in crowds of foes, / Britannia's safety, and the world's repose" (170-4), Philips represents Marlborough as virtually immortal. A shot aimed at the Duke "miss'd her Scope (for Destiny withstood / Th' approaching Wound) and guiltless Plough'd her Way / Beneath His Courser" (189-91), while "round His Sacred Head / The glowing Balls play innocent" (189-92). He warns him a few lines later to "[b]eware / Great Warrior, nor too prodigal of Life / Expose the *British* Safety" (194-6), but one may be excused for doubting if one for whom musket shot merely provides a halo is ever in any real danger. The same lack of tension that some have noted as a problem in the war in heaven of *Paradise Lost* afflicts *Bleinheim* as well: this Christ-like man can neither lose nor be in any real personal danger. Philips's difficulty in presenting his subject-matter in an appropriate poetic form is, of course, partly attributable to his discomfort with that subject-matter, but it is also an example of the more general difficulty expressed earlier by Prior. The difficulty is exacerbated by his choice of epic as the genre upon which to model his poem. As Michael Murrin notes, English poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, reflecting and responding to profound social and military changes that rendered the continuance of traditions of the literary representation of war and military heroism untenable, set the pattern for "the epic without war" (232).[51] Philips's attempt to use epic explicitly for the representation of modern warfare thus struggles against the patterns developed by his predecessors in the English epic tradition of the previous two centuries.

Whereas Philips chooses to model his poem on the greatest of English epics, John Oldmixon disavows epic entirely and chooses pastoral as the genre in which to celebrate the victory. A more unlikely genre for the celebration of military virtues could scarcely be imagined. *A Pastoral Poem on the Victories at Schellenburgh and Bleinheim* appeared in early January, as did Philips's *Bleinheim*, but the two poems could hardly be more different. The long preface that Oldmixon attaches to his verses is perhaps of more interest to this discussion than the poem itself. In it he defends his use of pastoral, surely an odd choice for a poem celebrating a military victory, and argues that what might seem more appropriate genres--such as epic or heroic drama--have been irredeemably tainted by being used to celebrate false heroism:[52]

---

[51] Murrin further notes that while "the English led in the development of the epic without war," they were not alone in doing so: "The successful epics of the seventeenth century generally followed this pattern. Poets either limited war to small portions of their narratives, as Milton did for *Paradise Lost*, or they dropped it altogether, as did Marino in *L'Adone* and Milton in *Paradise Regained*. A social or rhetorical explanation would not account for this pan-European development, for it involved countries like Portugal, which still had a living military tradition in the 1570s, as well as those like Italy and England, which had become increasingly civilian" (240).

> Though some of the ancient Heroes might make a good use of their Power, yet that does not excuse their seizing it out of the Hands of those to whom it belong'd, and leaving it in Possession of such as knew not that 'twas given them for any other purpose than to indulge their passions, and commit all sorts of Violence and Injustice, without fear of Punishment or Controul. If the Flatterers of *Alexander* and *Caesar* had been ask'd what either of them had done for their Country, must they not have answer'd, *they found her Free, and left her a Slave.* The Liberties of *Greece* and *Rome* were their most Valuable Conquests; and yet these are the Men on whose Altars all the Poetical Incense of Antiquity is offer'd. (viii-ix)

---

[52] Robert D. Horn notes, in his bibliographical study of writings on Marlborough, that Oldmixon again discusses the appropriateness of various genres at the beginning of *Iberia Liberata: A Poem*, published in January 1706, in which he celebrates the successes of British troops in Spain (Horn 164); clearly genre is an area of contestation for him. Oldmixon is not alone in his concern with genre; Margaret Anne Doody notes in *The Daring Muse* that "Civil War verse questioned the genres which had been worked out from the time of the Tudors to that of the Metaphysicals and the tribe of Ben. Genres lose their safety and perfection; that a form or style is suited to only one set of uses becomes questionable. . . . The question of genres has to be worked out again, and all style is recognized as concealing lurking dangers" (32).

Not only did the ancient poets themselves too often celebrate false heroes in their work, Oldmixon asserts, they have inspired modern poets to do likewise:

> These are the Models of Heroic Virtue on the Stage, and the Poets in our Days have been so Charm'd with the Shining Pictures drawn of them by the Antients that they seem to make it one of the first Principles of their Art for a Hero to own no Law but his Will, and set no Bounds to his Ambition, but the acquiring universal Empire. (ix-x)

The French king is a modern example of these false heroes; worse, he "is the first Hero that assum'd the Title of *Le Grand*, without ever having been in any Action" (x-xi). The heroic modes of poetry are therefore tainted not only by previous examples celebrating false heroism, but also by their association with Frenchness. In order, therefore, to "Present the *British Hero* with something worthy the Dignity of the *British Muse*" (xv), Oldmixon turns to pastoral, a genre apparently untainted with either falseness or foreignness. He disparagingly cites two French critics, Boileau and Rapin, who would seek to confine the genre "to the Loves, the Sports, the Piques, the Jealousies, Quarrels, Intrigues, Passions and Adventures of Shepherds" (xxii), and asserts instead "the Dignity of the *Rural Muse*" (xxiii). Shepherds, he argues, have in former days "had not only the Charge of their Flocks upon their Hands, but the Cares of the State" (xxiii); he therefore disdains those "French Criticks" who consider them too "*ignorant and unpolish'd*" to take pleasure in discussing the affairs of the world. The implied contrast in all this, of course, is between true English simplicity and false French sophistication. Oldmixon is intent not merely on celebrating British victory over the French; he is determined to continue the battle on paper. The patriotic purpose of this sort of celebratory poetry could hardly be clearer.

Similar contrasts are made in the poem itself. In a long speech Thyrsis (one of the two shepherds whose conversation comprises the work) contrasts "here" and "there" (implicitly, Britain and France--or, more broadly, the Continent, much of which is under French control):

> No Foe molests us, or Affrights us here,
> Our tender Virgins are unus'd to fear,
> And our Hinds safely reap the bounteous Year.
> Not thus, on swelling *Danube*'s guilty Shoars,
> Nor where the *Rhine*'s Impetuous Torrent roars,
> Nor on the Banks of *Taijo*'s wealthy Flood,
> Whose golden Sands are now distain'd with Blood.
> They bear unwelcome Burthens to the Main,
> Foul streams of putrid gore, and Heaps of Slain:
> No musick there is heard; but dismal Cryes
> That vex the Air and rend the vaulted Skies;
> No Sights of Joy or Pleasure there are seen,
> No Loving in the Grove, nor dancing on the Green,
> But such as Death and wastful War afford,
> The Spoil and Ruins of the raging Sword.

While we, in Peace, our Rural Sports pursue,
And ev'ry Blessing know, that ere we knew.
No Noise is heard, no Murmurs in our Groves,
But Sighs of Happy or Unhappy Loves.
Few are our Pains, and Sweet to be endur'd,
And easie as our Wounds are made, they're Cur'd;
We dance, we sing, we frolick and are gay,
And when we please we Love, and when we please we Play.
(3-4)[53]

Oldmixon's choice of pastoral to celebrate a military victory now becomes more explicable, for what he is celebrating is not in fact the battle itself--although it is discussed by the shepherds at some length--but the peace and plenty of Britain that are assured by that victory. The Queen and Marlborough, her deputy, are therefore chiefly celebrated as the architects of that prosperity: "[S]ay to whom we owe / This World of Joy, amidst a world of Woe: / With us 'tis Peace--and thou hast lately seen, / In mighty *Caesar*'s Throne, a Mighty QUEEN" (4). In some better future, the goodness to which her reign gives rise shall spread beyond Britain's borders:

Her High Example shall at last Prevail,
And all the Wicked Arts of Discord Fail.

---

[53] Lines numbers not being provided for this poem, references are made to page numbers instead.

> Her Foreign and Domestick Foes no more,
> Shall dare to tempt her Justice and her Pow'r:
> Faction before her Piety shall fall,
> And CHURCHILL in her Name subdue the trembling *Gaul*. (9)

The true heroism that Anne and Marlborough embody will then finally expose the false heroism of Louis for the counterfeit it is:

> The Boaster Monarch who aspir'd to rise,
> In Height to Equal Jove and mate the Skyes,
> Now growles[54] in the Dust, his Chiefs Renown'd
> To ANNA's Chariot Wheels Ingloriously are bound,
> And CHURCHILL's Brows with Double Lawrels Crown'd. (9-10)

Hopes were high after the glories of Blenheim. Churchill's prose might be somewhat purple, but he captures Marlborough's (and others') spirit of hope and urgency in the months after the battle before the beginning of the next campaigning season:

> This was no time for triumph or repose. Was the war to drag on in costly, bloody gnawings around the frontiers of France until perhaps it died down in disastrous futility, until the Alliance, reforged on the anvil of Blenheim, broke again to pieces? For a thrust at the heart, the chance, the means, the time, and--might he not feel?--the man had

---

[54] "Grovels" would seem to make more sense here.

> now come. Beyond the battle-smoke of a terrible year he saw peace rising out of an otherwise endless warfare, and order emerging from chaos, with England the glorious deliverer at the summit. (II.499-500)

Although Marlborough began the 1705 campaigning season determined that it should "complete the work of Blenheim and bring Louis XIV to make a reasonable peace" (Barnett 140), it was to prove a disappointing year. Most historians agree with Churchill in arguing that the immediate "fruits of victory were largely cast away by the jealousies of the allies and the fatal caution of the Dutch in 1705" (II.18). The French forces in the north had the benefit of unity of command, whereas Marlborough struggled with "lamentably defective control" (Churchill II.523); repeatedly, in this and subsequent campaigning seasons, "the French monarchy moved faster than a cumbersome coalition" (Barnett 159). Marlborough's strategy of 1705 "absolutely depended . . . on his wielding the initiative from the very start of the campaign" (Barnett 140). The Dutch, however, were both unready to take the field so quickly and unwilling to shift troops away from their own borders at Marlborough's behest, despite his earlier spectacular success doing just that. Other factors, such as the failure of local officers to stock supply depots, also affected his ability to act. "I may asure you," he wrote in frustration to Godolphin in June 1705, "that no on[e] thing, neither for troups nor the subsistence of the army, that was promised me has been performed. . . . If this can't be remidyed, and we shall opinatre the staying here, this army may be ruined without fighting" (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I. 438-9). His frustration with the Dutch, for the third time aborting a campaign by their recalcitrance, steadily increased. "If I had known beforehand what I must have endured by relying on the pepel of this country, no reasons could have perswaded me to have undertaken this campagne," he wrote to his wife (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I.443). But he continued to present a front of unbroken unity among the allies, writing to Godolphin after yet another setback in the autumn that

> If I had not had more regardes for the publick then for myself, I should have write very plainly the truth of the unreasonable disapointement I meet with that day, which if I had, I am very confident the common peple of Holland would have done me justice. But that would have given advantage to the French, which was reason enough for me to avoyde doing itt. (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I.485)

An open quarrel with the Dutch "would come as a godsend to the powerful anti-war factions in both countries, and equally to the no less powerful anti-Dutch faction in England" (Barnett 156); therefore he reluctantly abandoned his ambitious plans and acquiesced in their far more limited defensive objectives.

Given the unsatisfactory military results of 1705, celebratory verse (except for a few minor poems looking back to Blenheim) was rather thin on the ground. But 1706 was, in Robert Horn's words, "an *annus mirabilis*, the highest point in Marlborough's fortunes, and . . . in his [and England's] hopes of completely defeating France and the armies of Louis XIV" (161); it was also "perhaps the most productive year for panegyrics on Marlborough's successes, with not only his second great victory at Ramillies [23 May 1706 N.S.], but also the triumph of English policy, largely his, and English financial subsidy in the victories of Eugene in the Italian campaign" (Horn 161). Limited by Dutch caution to the Low Countries, Marlborough nevertheless achieved a great victory against a French initiative led by Villeroy. Marlborough himself was several times during the battle in great personal danger, thrown from his horse while being pursued by French cavalry and later nearly hit by a cannonball while remounting; the cannonball famously sheered off his equerry's head as he stood holding the Duke's stirrup, and in one contemporary account went through Marlborough's legs as he swung his right leg over the saddle (Barnett 168). French losses were again astoundingly high, as was confusion among the French forces:

> Of the brilliant army of sixty-three thousand men which had set out so confidently in the morning to seek a decision of arms, barely fifteen thousand were under control. Twelve thousand had fallen killed or wounded in the clash. Nearly six thousand were prisoners of the

> Allies.[55] The rest had dispersed to every quarter of the compass, seeking the gates of some friendly town. For more than a month no semblance of a French army could keep the field. (Churchill III.131)

Villeroy's entire army was destroyed as a fighting force (Barnett 170), and by the close of the 1706 campaigning season Marlborough "had completed the conquest of almost the whole Spanish Netherlands. . . . Now Louis XIV's own domains lay before his victorious sword" (Barnett 171).

Matthew Prior and William Congreve were among those who made panegyrical contributions in this year. Prior's "An Ode, Humbly Inscrib'd to the Queen. On the Glorious Success of Her Majesty's Arms, 1706" appeared in July, and Congreve's "A Pindarique Ode Humbly Offer'd to the Queen On the Victorious Progress of HER MAJESTY's Arms under the Conduct of the DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH" in August. Both feel the need to defend in prefaces their formal choices. Prior proclaims Horace and Spenser his models. As William Leigh Godschalk notes, "Prior never concealed his poetic debt to Spenser," and owned copies of both *The Faerie Queene* and the *Works*, both annotated in his hand (52). "[I]t was impossible, " Prior asserts in his preface to the ode, "not to have a Mind to follow Our great Countryman SPENSER" (230). Spenser thus functions as a touchstone of Englishness in this celebration of the modern English hero. Prior is also careful to situate Horace firmly within the context of English heroism: "That Noble Part of the *Ode* which I just now mention'd, . . . where HORACE praises the Romans, as being Descended from ÆNEAS, I have turn'd to the Honor of the BRITISH Nation, descended from BRUTE, likewise a TROJAN" (231). He connects this story with GEOFFREY of Monmouth, the "*Monkish* Writers," Camden, and Milton (although he admits that Milton probably didn't believe it, however pleasing he may have thought it); it carries, therefore, he insists, "a Poetical Authority, which is sufficient for our Purpose" (231). His brief defence of his formal choices, then, focusses heavily on the relevance of his models to the construction of a national hero, an exemplar of English manhood. The poem itself continues in a similar vein; as Augustus's triumphs were celebrated by Horace and Elizabeth's by Spenser, so shall Anne's, whose "Arms pursue / Paths of Renown, and climb Ascents of Fame, / Which nor AUGUSTUS, nor ELIZA knew" (21-3), be sung by Prior, although he modestly confesses himself "all too mean for such a Task" (31). Nevertheless, inspired to emulation by the examples of Horace's "impetuous Heat" (33) and Spenser's "Native Style" (34), and "smit with Pleasure of my Country's Praise" (36), he will soar "High as OLYMPUS" (38). Frances Mayhew Rippy calls the poem "unremarkable in content," and notes Prior's mild deprecation in its lines of his panegyric talents; only its use of a modified Spenserian stanza is particularly noteworthy (54). That Prior considered the writing of such panegyrical verse a literary dead-end is indicated by the fact that this is his last attempt at the genre (Rippy 54-5), and an unremarkable attempt it is.

---

[55] A more recent historian, Correlli Barnett, says that "the French had lost 15,000 killed and wounded on the battlefield, and as many again in prisoners: half their strength" (170).

Like Prior, Congreve attaches to his poem celebrating the victory at Ramillies a preface explaining and defending his formal choice. "The following Ode is an Attempt towards restoring the Regularity of the ancient Lyrick Poetry, which seems to be altogether forgotten or unknown by our *English* Writers," he begins (82). He laments the inaccuracy and presumption of those moderns who have inaccurately called their poems Pindaric odes, "pretending to be written in Imitation of the Manner and Stile of Pindar, and yet I do not know that there is to this Day extant in our Language, one Ode contriv'd after his Model" (82). He then goes on to describe the characteristics of a true Pindaric ode, and to defend his departures from them; for example, being without a chorus to sing the ode, the use of Pindar's "Titles, as well as Use of *Strophe*, *Antistrophe*, and *Epode*" would be "Obsolete and Impertinent" (84-5). So why does he choose to use it as his model? He is not explicit about the reasons for his choice, but he does note that "all the Odes of *Pindar* are Songs of Triumph, Victory or Success in the *Grecian* Games" (83). More important seems to be the form's "extraordinary Regularity" (Congreve 85):

> Nothing can be call'd Beautiful without Proportion. When Symmetry and Harmony are wanting, neither the Eye nor the Ear can be pleas'd. Therefore certainly *Poetry*, which includes Painting and Music, should not be destitute of 'em; and of all *Poetry*, especially the *Ode*, whose End and Essence is Harmony. (Congreve 85)

But any sense of the greatness of his subject--Marlborough's great victory--is lost in Congreve's concentration on form. He seems to hope that the form itself will create the greatness it exists to celebrate, even as he admits how far short he has fallen from the strengths of his model: "I have only given an Instance of what is practicable, and am sensible that I am as distant from the Force and Elevation of *Pindar*, as others have hitherto been from the Harmony and Regularity of his Numbers" (Congreve 84). "Congreve," Mary I. Oates has noted, "surely much stronger when satirical than when decked in singing robes, sacrificed sublimity to polish in the full consciousness that he was doing so. The Pindaric Ode, then, used as it traditionally had been to celebrate human greatness and goodness, was surely moribund" (397).

Thus, even at the height of Marlborough's public acclaim, the literary representation of his greatness is inadequate to its subject. Prior's and Congreve's responses to Ramillies are far less interesting than the major poetic responses to Blenheim, although even those earlier efforts had struggled to find a form adequate to the subject. But even dull panegyrical effusions were soon to vanish under a tide of (far more inventive and energetic) invective. In contrast to the outbursts of enthusiasm that followed the victories of Blenheim and Ramillies, literary responses to the battles of Oudenarde (11 July 1708 N.S.) and Malplaquet (16 September 1709 N.S.) were far less laudatory. Robert Horn notes that, despite the splendidness of the victory at Oudenarde, "the political tide was turning," and the meager crop of panegyric that resulted is evidence of this

(260). The response to Malplaquet was even less impressive:[56] "This year [1709] is notable for an increasing proportion of satires, and corresponding hostility toward the Duke of Marlborough and his Duchess as well. Little significant panegyric appears; rather there is an appeal for an Addison and deploring of the quality of verse" (Horn 292). What Correlli Barnett calls "the slow mysterious tide of English opinion" (240) had begun to turn against the war, against the Whigs, and against Marlborough, whose position was inextricably linked to both.[57]

---

[56] Of course, Malplaquet was not a particularly impressive victory. Although Parliament voted it a victory, it was really more of a draw, with neither party achieving a convincing position. And the casualties were enormous: "Europe was appalled at the slaughter of Malplaquet. . . . Not until Borodino in 1812 was the carnage of this day surpassed" (Churchill IV.172). The allies lost 18,000 men, and the French 11,000 (Barnett 240). Among the Allies, British losses were less severe: "Only the British, being reserved for the final onslaught on the French centre, got off relatively lightly, with fewer than six hundred killed and 1300 wounded out of 14,000 engaged" (Barnett 239). Marlborough had "won at every point. The enemy had been beaten out of all their defences and driven from the field as a result of the heart-shaking struggle. But they had not been routed: they had not been destroyed. They had got off as an army, and indeed, as a proud army. They retreated, but they cheered. They were beaten, but they boasted" (Churchill IV. 174).

[57] Despite Marlborough's unwilling association with the Whigs as the party most strongly in support of the war, he was himself an adherent of neither party. "All parties are alike," he wrote to Sarah (herself a fervent Whig) in 1703; "For in the humor I now am in, and that I hope in God I shal ever be off, I think both partys unreasonable and unjust" (*The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* I.250). He later sent a message to his son-in-law with a similar assertion: "Tell Lord Sunderland that I thank him for his letter, and that I hope I shall always continue in the humour I am now in, that is, to be governed by neither party, but to do what I think is best for England, by which I shall disoblige both parties" (qtd by Churchill II.276). But circumstances were to force Marlborough into a closer association with the Whigs than he would have liked, despite what Churchill calls his "temperamental Toryism": "Marlborough was a Tory by origin, sentiment, and profession" (Churchill II.66). As the Whigs' fortunes sank, and the queen's dislike for and distrust of them grew, Marlborough's position also grew increasingly unstable.

Marlborough's success had been such that his position as national hero should have been unassailable; in the years after Blenheim, "he won every battle, took every fort that he besieged, held the Grand Alliance together, broke the threatening supremacy of France, and established England as a major power" (Backscheider, Introduction ii). Winston Churchill begins his four-volume biography of Marlborough by expressing his wonder at the gap between achievement and reputation:[58]

> "There are few successful commanders," says Creasy, "on whom Fame has shone so unwillingly as upon John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough." I believe this is true; and it is an interesting historical study to examine the causes which have made so great a contrast between the glory and importance of his deeds and the small regard of his countrymen for his memory. (I.3)

But lingering antimilitarism, exacerbated by the inheritance of the traumatic Civil War years and subsequent civil and political instability, and the political climate of the time worked against him. The Civil War had shaped Marlborough's character as well as the larger culture. Historian David Chandler writes, "The genteel poverty and confused political atmosphere of his earliest years at Asche

---

[58] In fact, the desire to redress this imbalance provides one of the major motivations for the writing of the biography.

House[59] indubitably left their mark" (312). Winston Churchill speculates about the effects of such a childhood on the young John Churchill:

> The two prevailing impressions which such experiences might arouse in the mind of a child would be, first, a hatred of poverty and dependence, and secondly, the need of hiding thoughts and feelings from those to whom their expression would be repugnant. . . . To these was added a third: the importance of having friends and connexions on both sides of a quarrel. (I.28)

Churchill argues that these childhood experiences provide the key to his character:

> Certainly the whole life of John Churchill bore the imprint of his youth. That impenetrable reserve under graceful and courteous manners; those unceasing contacts and correspondences with opponents; that iron parsimony and personal frugality, never relaxed in the blaze of fortune and abundance; that hatred of waste and improvidence in all their forms--all these could find their roots in the bleak years at Ashe. (I.28)

---

[59] Asche (also spelled Ashe) House was the family home of the Drakes, Marlborough's mother's family. Lady Drake, his grandmother, was a staunch Parliamentarian, and her home provided a safe haven for the Churchill family (Royalists all) during the Interregnum, despite having been set on fire by Royalist troops in 1644; most of the Churchill children, including John, were born there (Rowse 37-38).

Most of the contemporary attacks on Marlborough focussed on just these sorts of personality traits, so the contention that they can be traced back to his youthful experience of the Civil War suggests an intriguing linkage between the national trauma and its shaping effect on one very important product of it. Certainly personal factors played a role in Marlborough's increasingly shaky position after 1708. His wife's estrangement from the queen, long her devoted friend but now become resentful of Sarah's domineering ways and increasingly under the influence of the Tories, widened the gap between monarch and general, thereby leaving him more vulnerable to attack. This vulnerability is scathingly noted by Swift in *The Conduct of the Allies*: "the Q----- was no longer able to bear the Tyranny and Insolence of those ungrateful Servants,[60] who as they *wexed the Fatter*, did but *kick the more*" (51). Also, the Tories, led by Robert Harley, later Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, were eager to improve their political standing by making the most of their opportunities. Marlborough--with his high reputation as general, statesman, and bulwark against French pretensions in Europe-- stood in their way. To undermine his position they employed a number of spies, informants, and propagandists, Daniel Defoe and Jonathan Swift among the latter of these.

Defoe was the more moderate of the two, and genuinely admired Marlborough and his accomplishments. *A Short Narrative of the Life and Actions of*

---

[60] By whom he chiefly though not exclusively means the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. Godolphin also comes in for his share of opprobrium in *The Conduct of the Allies*, as do larger groups, such as the Whigs and the "Monied Men" who benefited financially from supply contracts and government loans.

His Grace John, D. of Marlborough, called by Paula Backscheider a "barometer for the age and for Defoe," was published (anonymously, the author identified only as "an Old Officer in the Army"[61]) on 20 February 1711 (Backscheider, Introduction ii, xii-xiii). In it Defoe positions himself carefully in opposition to those members of the press who have attacked Marlborough most viciously, including Swift[62] (Backscheider, Introduction ix-x):

> Seeing the Press is open, and every body dares Write and Publish what he pleases, and Persons of the highest Honour and Virtue, to the great Shame and Scandal of our Country, are expos'd to the World, in base Pamphlets; and according to the Malice or Misunderstanding of the Authors, are represented to the World unworthy of the Favour of the Prince, as well as Obnoxious to the Common-Wealth, in which they live: It becomes every honest Man, who knows more of the Matter, to set things in a true Light, to undeceive the People, as much as he is able, that they may be no longer impos'd on by such false

---

[61] A summary of the convincing case for Defoe's authorship is provided by Paula Backscheider in an appendix to the Augustan Reprint Society's edition of *A Short Narrative* (49-51).

[62] Similar criticisms of the relative unreliability of other writers and publications had been made by Defoe before. Backscheider notes that he included them frequently in the *Review*: "By discrediting the other papers Defoe puffed his own" (*Daniel Defoe* 153).

> Reports, which in the end may prove Dangerous and Fatal.
>
> (3-4)

Defoe thus claims the authority of a moderate and a truth-teller whose interest is in the welfare of both "Prince" and "Common-Wealth."

By the late seventeenth century, "it had become apparent that in time of great political controversy it was virtually impossible to suppress the opposition press" (Feather 53). The lapsing of the Licensing Act after 1694 removed what few controls remained. Numerous attempts to revive it were made: "Between 1695 and 1704 no fewer than nine Bills were introduced into Parliament which would have revived virtually the whole of the Licensing Act. For various reasons all were lost. . . . By 1705, the revival of licensing in its old form was a dead issue" (Feather 85). From the ashes of the Act, the modern press was born:

> For politics as for journalism, the end of the Stuart censorship of the press, with the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695, proved a seminal event. To it can be traced the spectacular rise of "Grub Street", that fictitious abode of a new generation of political writers[63] whose many different talents--whether for exposition, demolition, satire or mere

---

[63] The fictional nature of Grub Street is strongly disputed by Pat Rogers in *Hacks and Dunces: Pope, Swift and Grub Street*: "Now the truth is that the phrase we are considering [Grub Street] incorporates not a fiction, but synecdoche. And contemporary usage--as opposed to nineteenth-century misapplication of the term--reflects more than a fabulous existence. Grub Street was, as Ian Watt accurately describes it, a legend. That is to say, the figurative meaning was based on a vestigial truth. This germ of reality became increasingly remote and spectral, but it was there all the same" (19).

> abuse--were recruited by the Whig and Tory parties.
>
> (Holmes and Speck 66)

Politicians and public figures subsequently had to learn to live with a lively and largely uncontrolled (and uncontrollable) press. Harley was one of the first to recognise the necessity for "the exploitation of a press which he could no longer control," and Daniel Defoe was one of his means of accomplishing his goal (Feather 86). Certainly Harley was vastly more successful at manipulating the press than was Marlborough, who was reduced to appealing to Harley "to silence the libellous attacks by journalists" (Backscheider, Introduction viii). Harley's response to such appeals was a smooth denial of responsibility: "I do assure your grace I neither know nor desire to know any of the authors; and as I heartily wish this barbarous war was at an end, I shall be very ready to take my part in suppressing them" (qtd by Backscheider, Introduction viii). In need of increased revenues, Harley also began the taxation of printed matter; the extension in 1712 of stamp duties, applicable to other categories of printed matter since 1711, to newspapers has, as noted by John Feather, "caused Harley's motives to be called into question":

> The need for revenue is beyond dispute, but in view of the interest in the press which Harley had shown over the previous decade it has been suggested that the duty was also intended as a measure of censorship, since the newspaper owners would have to pass on the cost of the tax to their customers and thus double the price of their

> papers from 1d to 2d (or 1d to 1 1/2d for a half-sheet newspaper). (Feather 86).

If censorship was Harley's motive, he did not ultimately succeed, although the initial effect of the 1712 Act was temporarily to reduce circulation (Feather 87). It is no coincidence, then, that the years in which the press first operated with remarkable freedom were also those in which Marlborough found himself subject to the most unrelenting attacks in the public press.[64]

However much Marlborough's popularity as hero may have stood in Harley's and the Tories' way, Harley also needed Marlborough to bring the war to an end: "Harley knew that Marlborough was essential until peace negotiations were secured. . . . [He] became increasingly convinced that only peace would preserve his power, and Marlborough's power and reputation were essential for an acceptable peace" (Backscheider, Introduction vii). Defoe's reluctance to attack Marlborough without reserve as so many other pamphleteers and journalists were doing and his continued admiration for Marlborough's accomplishments and abilities were therefore of use to Harley in 1711. Paula Backscheider even considers the possibility that *A Short Narrative* may have been produced by Defoe quite independently of Harley's orders, "but even if the possibility that the *Life* was not expressly ordered by Harley is considered, it is noteworthy that nothing in it is offensive to Harley, and more important, remarkable that it serves Harley's needs and ends at the time so well" (Backscheider, Introduction ix). Defoe's insistence at the beginning of the the text that unrelenting attacks on Marlborough might well "prove Dangerous and Fatal" (4) thus sets the tone for what follows. He adopts the persona, as already noted, of "an Old Officer in the Army" to narrate the life of the Duke--and Marlborough, as many biographers and historians have noted, was extraordinarily popular with his men.[65]

---

[64] In this, his situation was much different from that of the great military hero of a century later, the Duke of Wellington, who rose to his heights of heroic acclaim at a time of strict government control of the press and vastly increased stamp duties that brought the price of a newspaper to equal "the normal daily wage of a working man" (Feather 87). See Chapter 5.

Before beginning his narrative, the narrator makes his purpose explicit: he wishes to account for the precipitous slide Marlborough's public reputation has suffered, a slide that seems inexplicable given the man's accomplishments and the recent public response to them.

> I shall therefore give a *short Narrative* of the *Actions* of the most Illustrious *John* Duke of *Marlborough*, with some Reflections on them, that People may not wonder how it comes to pass, that such a Great Captain, equal no doubt to any in all Ages, considering the Powers whom he has Oppos'd, after all his Victories, should be represented in the publick Writings of the Town, as over-honoured and over-Paid for all his past Services, and neglected and

---

[65] Even Thomas Babington Macaulay, despite his unremitting hostility to Marlborough, has to admit that, although he does his best to put an unfavourable spin on it: "Nothing but the union of dauntless courage and commanding powers of mind with a bland temper and winning manners could have enabled him to gain and keep, in spite of faults eminently unsoldier-like, the good will of his soldiers" (III.336).

> almost forgotten in the midst of all his Triumphs, and his Name almost lost from the Mouths of those People, who for several Years last past, and not many Months since, have been fill'd with his Praises. (4)

He repeats more than once the assertion that such reversals of fortune are common in human history:

> And now at first View a Man might wonder how it should come to pass that such a Renown'd General, after so many Signal Services, and great Actions, for the good of his Country, should be so undervalued and slighted at his return home from the very middle of his Labours, by any one who pretends to value the good of his Nation: But this is no new Thing, all the Histories of the World are full of Examples to this purpose, and most of them of Men of War and Great Captains. (20-21)

And again: " But this has been the Fortune of the most glorious Persons, to be envied and persecuted whilst they are alive, and when taken away from us by some unlucky Accident, are desir'd too late, and lamented with a Witness" (37). The narrator attributes the sudden deterioration in Marlborough's reputation to a number of causes: envy (6, 21, 37-38), the ruthless ambition of those who seek to displace and replace him (9), treachery (12), irreligion (15), cowardice (39-40), and the common tendency for amateurs to critique from a safe distance the performance of those in the thick of the action[66] (25, 26). He is quite scathing about these latter civilian critics, fittingly for a narrator supposed himself to be a military man:

> Another Scandal was lately rais'd against his Grace, as touching his good Conduct and Skill, as he is a General; and this is much among those sort of People, whose Mouths go off smartly with a Whiff of Tobacco, and fight Battles, and take Towns over a Dish of Coffee. They give out, like Men of great Understanding in the Art Military, that the Duke is more beholding to his Good-Fortune than his Skill, in the Advantages he has gain'd over the *French*; and that he may thank the Prince of *Savoy*, and the good Forces which he Commands, more than his own Skill in War, for his great Reputation. (26)

The narrator does not deny that more than skill may be involved in the achievement of military victories, but credits God rather than luck or good colleagues and forces: "The Good-Fortune of His Grace ought to be attributed to the good Providence of GOD, for which, both he and the whole Nation ought to be thankful" (26). Besides, as he sardonically notes, good fortune is more likely to follow those with the necessary skills and virtues than those who lack them:

---

[66] This type of critique is a sort of military armchair quarterbacking fundamental to such activities as American Civil War reenactments and also to much rehashing by scholars and enthusiasts of military engagements of the past.

> But then, *Nullum numen abest, si sit Prudentia*. The General that is Prudent, and Vigilant, and Temperate, Alert, and Industrious, with an humble Submission to the Will of the Almighty, takes the right way of obliging Fortune to be of his Side: or, to speak better, the Blessings of Heaven to crown his Endeavours: For in War 'tis seldom known, (quite contrary to the Old Proverb) that in conducting Armies and Fighting Battles, *Fools have Fortune*. (26-27)

God may be on the side of the heaviest battalions (although Marlborough could and did achieve victory against superior forces), but He is also on the side of the best generals: "So that you see 'tis the Experienc'd, Skilful, Old General who is best Judge of times of Fighting; and that Man who asperses his Honour is to be suspected as either wanting Judgment, or an Enemy to the Publick" (25).

The narrator clearly attributes the criticism of Marlborough to eternal human passions, and even to devilish manipulations, not to the particular circumstances--political or personal--then prevailing:

> *There is nothing new*, saith Solomon, *under the Sun;* the same Causes will always produce the same Effects; and while Mankind bear about them, the various Passions of Love and Joy, Hatred and Grief, the cunning Engineer, that stands behind the Curtain, will influence and work these Passions according to his Malice, to the destruction of Persons of highest Worth. (4)

His language often carefully reinforces the sense that the story of Marlborough's downfall is one of eternal verities rather than of contemporary particularity, as in the Biblical cadences of "how it should come to pass" (20). Repeated comparisons to figures of ancient history, including "that Renown'd Captain *Epaminondas*" (31), those heroic exemplars Scipio and Cato (32), Hannibal (23-25, 29, 44), and even Moses (45), reinforce the timelessness rather than the particularity of the narrative. The story of Marlborough's life therefore becomes an exemplary morality tale of the vagaries of fortune, not a narrative from which particular knowledge of contemporary political machinations might be gleaned:

> For the most eminent Virtues are but as so many fair Marks set up on high for Envy to shoot at with her poysonous Darts, and in all States, 'tis sometimes dangerous to be Great and Good, for cunning Envy is often very strong, and when once its Devices are effectually spread in the Mouths of the Multitude, will produce a Blast able to blow down the most lofty Cedar. . . . (21)

Clearly it served Harley's and the Tories' purposes to distract attention away from the role that faction, personal power-seeking, and political gamesmanship played in the storm of criticism surrounding Marlborough at this time. If the eternal pattern of the ever-moving wheel of fortune was to blame for the deterioration in his reputation, surely Harley could be considered blameless. For who, after all, can fight

Fortune? Marlborough's eventual downfall is therefore rendered inevitable while his current usefulness remains protected.

The narrator repeatedly reminds readers of the assertion with which he began his narrative, that he, unlike Marlborough's calumniators, has the interests of the nation at heart rather than the indulgence of base motives:

> 'Tis a thing of ill Consequence to bring a Disreputation on the good Name of a General; and to lessen his Honour is to dispirit his Army: for when the forces under his Command have once a mean Opinion of the Integrity, and Honour, and Conduct of their General, they may be drawn out and forced to Battle, but never be perswaded to think of Laurels and Victory. (44)

Indeed, in the end only the enemy can benefit from the downfall of an able general: "'Tis an old Piece of Policy for an Enemy, if possible, to bring an Odium on the Honour of a general against whom he is to act" (44). Therefore those who attack Marlborough and undermine his position may fairly be accused of serving the French cause: "And, without doubt, the *French* King would have been very well satisfied, if this same Aspersion, which was lately spread abroad concerning our General, had taken the effect of having him laid aside, and put out of his Places" (45). And so it was to prove, as Marlborough's removal from power marked the sudden improvement of French fortunes.

Swift was far less temperate than Defoe. *The Conduct of the Allies* has been called "the most effective pamphlet ever penned by England's greatest pamphleteer" (Wheeler xli). With it, Samuel Johnson says, Swift "attained the zenith of his political importance" (II.193). Tremendous things have been claimed for this pamphlet: "It was probably, as its author deemed, the main factor which saved the ministry at that juncture and brought about the peace" (Wheeler xli). More negatively, Richard Glover credits it, brilliant though he acknowledges it to be (17), with extensively damaging long-term military and foreign policy in Britain:

> So the theory of Swift died hard. While it lingered, the politicians whose minds it ruled had difficulty in regarding the army as anything more than an instrument for police work at home and overpowering the enemy's isolated garrisons abroad; and while the army's recognized offensive purposes were as petty as that, there could be no object in seeking the means for making more effective use of it. So lack of the very means of sound planning lived on too. (Glover 18)

Robert Gordon dismisses such a high estimate of the pamphlet's effectiveness, saying that "it is dangerous to credit Swift with a decisive influence even upon other writers" in the ongoing standing army debates (188). Samuel Johnson's verdict is more measured:

> *Whatever is received*, says the schools, *is received in proportion to the recipient*. The power of a political treatise depends much upon the disposition of the people; the

> nation was then combustible, and a spark set it on fire. . . . To its propagation certainly no agency of power or influence was wanting. It furnished arguments for conversation, speeches for debate, and materials for parliamentary resolutions. (*Lives* II.194)

Whatever its long-term effects on English foreign policy and politics, it sold extremely well, selling "at a rate that even astonished Swift himself" (Downie 113),[67] and it certainly played a role in bringing Marlborough down from the heights of adulation to which his military victories had raised him.

Swift's treatment of Marlborough in *The Conduct of the Allies* is considerably harsher than Defoe's in *A Short Narrative*.[68] He accuses Marlborough, motivated by "Interest and Ambition," of taking a leading role in "a Conspiracy . . . to go on with those Measures, which must perpetuate the War," regardless of any harm such a course of action might bring to his country or his monarch (51). After praising the queen for her "Prudence, Courage, and Firmness" in changing her advisors, he condemns the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough for gross mistreatment of the queen, though he coyly distances himself from the more extreme accusations by claiming to doubt them while carefully repeating them for the reader's benefit. The passage is so remarkable as to be worth quoting at length:

---

[67] Two days after its publication on 27 November 1711 it went into a second edition, which sold out within five hours; by 7 December it was in its fifth edition, and by the end of January it had gone through six editions, selling a total of 11,000 copies (Downie 113).

[68] Michael Foot's *The Pen and the Sword* (1957) is still an important study of Swift's complex attitude to Marlborough and the literary and political context in which he wrote *The Conduct of the Allies*. See also Irvin Ehrenpreis's account in *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age*, especially II.481-501.

> Some would pretend to lessen the Merit of this [i.e. of the queen's change of advisors], by telling us, that the Rudeness, the Tyranny, the Oppression, the Ingratitude of the late Favourites towards their Mistress, were no longer to be born. They produce Instances to shew, how Her M-----y was pursued through all Her Retreats, particularly at *Windsor*; where, after the Enemy had possessed themselves of every Inch of Ground, they at last attacked and stormed the Castle, forcing the Qu----n to fly to an adjoining Cottage, pursuant to the Advice of *Solomon*, who tells us, *It is better to dwell in a corner of the House-top, than with a brawling Woman in a wide House*. They would have it, that such continued ill Usage was enough to enflame the meekest Spirit: They blame the Favourites in point of Policy, and think it nothing extraordinary, that the Qu----n should be at an end of Her Patience, and resolve to discard them. But I am of another Opinion, and think their Proceedings were right. For nothing is so apt to break even the bravest Spirits, as a continual Chain of Oppressions: One Injury is best defended by a second, and this by a third. By these Steps, the Old *Masters of the Palace*

> in *France* became *Masters of the Kingdom;* and by these Steps, a *G--------l during Pleasure,* might have grown into a *G--------l for Life,* and a *G--------l for Life* into a *King*. So that I still insist upon it as a Wonder, how Her M--------y, thus besieged on all sides, was able to extricate Her self. (52)

Several aspects of this passage invite comment. Swift's use of military language to condemn Marlborough's treatment of the queen (and he and the Duchess are certainly the central if not the sole targets here) turns his deserved reputation as a military leader and strategist against him. Instead of using his ability in the service of country and crown, Swift tells readers, Marlborough uses it against them and solely in aid of his own position. He not only fails to be a good servant to the queen, he has foully betrayed the trust she had in him. He has thus deservedly forfeited such trust. This strategy allows Swift simultaneously to acknowledge and to condemn Marlborough's military prowess; since Swift cannot easily deny such qualities (although he does elsewhere minimise them), he does his best to present them as threatening. Thus the very excellence of Marlborough's military leadership becomes one more cause for alarm: if such a man besieges the seat of power, the threat to the stability of the throne and of the nation is real and requires immediate action to defeat it. And readers sensitive to indications of civil unrest and tottering thrones would be extremely susceptible to such rhetorical strategies. After all, people were still alive in 1711 who remembered the disasters of the Civil War (as did Marlborough himself). And with a childless, aging queen, an uncertain succession, and a Pretender still active on the Continent and supported by the French, such threats to stability seemed all too credible. Swift skilfully reinforces such ideas in the last sentence in the above-quoted passage, connecting Marlborough's request to be made General for life rather than at Her Majesty's pleasure (and thus to achieve a more stable personal position and more authority with recalcitrant allies like the Dutch) to designs on the throne itself, recalling Cromwell and the regicides. Marlborough's ambition, Swift wants readers to believe, truly knows no bounds, and his continuance in power invites a reoccurrence of civil discord and the threat of another disastrous civil war.

Other writers, many even more intemperate in their attacks than Swift, similarly connected Marlborough explicitly with memories of civil war. The anonymous author of *The Mobb's Address to my Lord M**** (1710) assures readers of Marlborough's desire to "use [his] utmost Care and Diligence to raise all riotous and tumultuous Assemblys, and with undaunted Vigour . . . oppose . . . all who will keep up the Authority of the Crown" (qtd by Backscheider, Introduction x). And *Oliver's Pocket Looking Glass* (1711) explicitly links Marlborough to Cromwell, the rebel and regicide, and depicts him as willing to use the "Army compos'd of almost all nations" under his command against the "body politic" (qtd by Backscheider, Introduction x). The transformation is thus complete. From being, in the early panegyrics, the embodiment of heroic English manhood, Marlborough has become the greatest threat to the stability and well-being of the nation.

Ironically, in the light of Swift's (and others') attempts to connect

Marlborough's ambition with Frenchness, his departure from power at the beginning of 1712 was a great boon to the French. Army discipline and supply suffered immediately from Marlborough's dismissal (Chandler 305), and 1712 saw a series of Allied disasters. The Treaty of Utrecht formally brought hostilities to a close, and France "emerged from the struggle far more advantageously than any statesman had even dreamed possible" (Chandler 307). Although Marlborough was able to return to England from exile in 1714, and died there in 1722, his reputation never wholly recovered from the calumnies heaped upon him in his last years of command. Even after his death, his reputation suffered further attacks, most notably that of Macaulay in the mid-nineteenth century, who was to describe him as the worst of villains--avaricious, cold, treacherous, and depraved (IV.41-45). From such attacks his descendent, Winston Churchill, was to attempt to rescue it in the 1930s. The lingering legacy of the Civil War and subsequent threats to civil order and the ignominious fall of the greatest military hero of the period meant that the eighteenth century would inherit a very mixed and troubled view of the military hero.

Chapter 4

Greatness and its Discontents:

Changing Notions of Heroic Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Britain

> *As it is necessary that all great and surprising events, the designs of which are laid, conducted, and brought to perfection by the utmost force of human invention and art, should be produced by great and eminent men, so the lives of such may be justly and properly styled the quintessence of history. In these, when delivered to us by sensible writers, we are not only most agreeably entertained, but most usefully instructed; for, besides the attaining hence a consummate knowledge of human nature in general; of its secret springs, various windings, and perplexed mazes; we have here before our eyes lively examples of whatever is amiable or detestable, worthy of admiration or abhorrence, and are consequently taught, in a manner infinitely more effectual than by precept, what we are eagerly to imitate or carefully to avoid.*
>
> *Henry Fielding,* Jonathan Wild *(39)*

The exemplary function of heroic mythmaking, as I have already argued, is central to its cultural importance. The heroic few are meant to inspire the rest of us--the ordinary and unheroic many--with feelings of awe and admiration, and a desire for emulation. That emulation may be partial and imperfect--indeed, it must be, or the heroic would become ordinary and unremarkable--but the heroic is meant to inspire us with a desire to do better, to approach heroic ideals more nearly than we otherwise thought possible. The Civil War and its aftermath, however, disrupted this emulatory function of the heroic; Marlborough's fall from grace may be read in large part as a symptom of this disruption. The development and popularity of parody and the mock-heroic in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries is another.

Margaret Anne Doody connects the importance of parody in general and mock-heroic in particular with the lingering after-effects of the Civil War: "It is no accident that the age of ideological and stylistic mimicry of the Civil War journals, broadsides and street-ballads preceded what is noticeably the great age of parody, or perhaps more properly the beginning of parody as we most commonly think of it today" (*Daring Muse* 49). And although she acknowledges that antiquity "invented the mock-heroic," she notes that the genre became particularly important in the decades after the Restoration (*Daring Muse* 49).[69] The Civil War bred instabilities, as I have already argued, instability of style and genre among them:

> To put it shortly, the Civil War poetry, ventriloqual and parodic

---

[69] In itself, this is hardly a novel observation, of course; it is impossible to read the poetry of the period without being aware of the importance of satire in general and mock-heroic in particular. "The most popular poem of the early Restoration," writes Bruce King, "was Samuel Butler's (1612-80) mock-heroic *Hudibras* (published in three parts, 1662, 1663, 1677)" (195). And the popularity of mock-heroic continued well into the next century.

> (or burlesque), meant that poetically nothing was safe any more. There was no form so stable that it could not be turned to inimical or at least strange purposes. There was no voice that could not be mimicked. No style was sacrosanct, no subject off-limits to abusive treatment. . . . All styles could be used for hostile, or at least quite alien, purposes. . . . The major literary implication of Civil War verse is that styles are not trustworthy. (Doody, *Daring Muse* 55)

Not only poetically, but socially, politically, and militarily, nothing was safe anymore. As I have already argued, the figure of the heroic warrior was rendered especially contentious and problematic by the Civil War and the many and various instabilities that followed it. And so the heroic became particularly vulnerable to parody, to the effects of mockery. Where the central role of a heroic poem should be played by a warrior hero, in the mock-heroic of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries it is played by decidedly less than heroic, and less than masculine (or even human) others--by a coin in *The Splendid Shilling* or a frivolous court beauty in *The Rape of the Lock*. Claude Rawson notes that mock-heroic "ostensibly attacked not the heroic but a modern reality lowered to subheroic proportions. All parody risks damaging what it touches, however" ("Henry Fielding" 137), and so such works arouse and express a troubling (but characteristic of the period, as already argued) "disquiet about heroic morality" (Rawson, "Henry Fielding" 137), and also about the ideology of heroic masculinity.

Of course, mock-heroic manifested itself in other genres than the poetic. Consider Henry Fielding's *The Life of Mr Jonathan Wild the Great* (1743),[70] for a later example. Fielding had already shown his willingness to blur the lines between genres in the preface to *Joseph Andrews* (1742), where he famously declares that work a "comic Epic-Poem in Prose" (4). The genre and antecedents of *Jonathan Wild* are more complicated. Critics have pointed out that *Jonathan Wild* "is not representative of the spirit of the comic prose epic" (Irwin 106). William Robert Irwin and many others have considered it as belonging chiefly to the popular genre of criminal biography (Irwin 80), but William J. Farrell downplays the resemblances to criminal biography and allies the book far more closely to "the traditional biography of the illustrious man" (216): "The conventions of the serious history are just as ironically inappropriate for recounting the low career of Wild, and, what is more important, they are customarily used to present the type of eminent personality the author is ridiculing" (Farrell 216).[71] What, or rather whom, then, is Fielding ridiculing? The analogy he makes between Wild's criminal organisation and Robert Walpole's political organisation is obvious and, as David Nokes points out, hardly original: "The thief-statesman parallel soon became a stock element in opposition attacks on Walpole, receiving its most memorable and effective expression in Gay's *Beggar's Opera* (1728). . . . When Fielding came to use the thief-statesman parallel in *Jonathan Wild* it was not merely unoriginal, it was positively old hat" (12-13). Moreover, by the time the book was first published, its chief political target had already fallen from power:

---

[70] *Jonathan Wild* was first published in the third volume of the *Miscellanies* in 1743, and then published separately, after extensive revision, in 1754.

[71] For example, Farrell points to Fielding's lengthy account of Wild's ancestry, parentage, birth, and education, matters to which criminal biography typically gives short shrift (217), but which are significant in the lives of illustrious men: "Even a cursory consideration of such themes as 'ancestry,' 'formal education,' and 'prophetic events at birth' reveals that they have little relevance to the ordinary man, that they are pertinent only to the lives of the great. Like the traditional *loci* of the rhetoricians, they are 'places' at which the biographer of an illustrious hero can find out or invent something to say about his subject. . . . [T]raditionally they are associated with the *vita* rather than with the romance or the novella" (Farrell 218).

> Throughout 1741 Walpole's political fortunes had been in evident decline, and he finally lost power in 1742. So, when the first edition . . . appeared . . . the following year, it may already have seemed out of date. It contained an attack on a politician who had now been removed, in the *persona* of a man hanged eighteen years earlier. Hardly the most effective of political satires, one might think. (Nokes 13)

But of course Fielding's target is much larger than one man, however corrupt; he is attacking "not so much Walpole himself as the combination of popular apathy and political opportunism that allowed such a man as Walpole to succeed so easily and for so long" (Nokes 18) and, in addition, he is problematising the cultural construction of heroic masculinity itself through the form of a mock-heroic prose narrative.

Fielding early casts doubt on the exemplary function of heroic men,[72] of whom the young Wild is a "passionate admirer, particularly of Alexander the Great" (*Jonathan Wild* 47). And we have already been told what to think of Alexander and similar historical figures renowned for their performance of heroic masculinity:

> In the histories of Alexander and Caesar we are frequently, and indeed impertinently, reminded of their benevolence and generosity, and indeed their clemency and kindness. When the former had with fire and sword overrun a vast empire, had destroyed the lives of an immense number of innocent wretches, had scattered ruin and desolation like a whirlwind, we are told, as an example of his clemency, that he did not cut the throat of an old woman, and ravish her daughters, but was content with only undoing them. And when the mighty Caesar, with wonderful greatness of mind, had destroyed the liberties of his country, and with all the means of fraud and force had placed himself at the

---

[72] Fielding does so elsewhere in his work, of course. Soldiers come in for considerable ridicule and criticism in all of his novels--*Joseph Andrews, Tom Jones,* and *Amelia*--as well as in his journalism. Interestingly, however, he was an admirer of Marlborough, under whom his father had served (McNeil 129, 141-2). For discussion of Fielding's treatment of the military in his fiction, see David McNeil's *The Grotesque Depiction of War and the Military in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (1990), especially 113-43. See also Brian McCrea's *Henry Fielding and the Politics of Mid-Eighteenth-Century England* (1981). For further discussion of Fielding's problematising of the concept of greatness in *Jonathan Wild*, see Ian A. Bell's *Henry Fielding: Authorship and Authority* (1994), especially 144-64.

> head of his equals, and corrupted and enslaved the greatest people whom the sun ever saw, we are reminded, as an evidence of his generosity, of his largesses to his followers and tools, by whose means he had accomplished his purpose, and by whose assistance he was to establish it. (40-41)

Wild continues to learn from such examples; some time later, when he is forming his first gang and moving up in the world, he wishes to "employ hands" to work for him, thereby placing himself among "that noble and great part" of mankind "who are generally distinguished into *conquerors, absolute princes, statesman,* and *prigs* [thieves] " (79). Alexander the Great again provides him with the appropriate model to follow: "Now all these differ from each other in greatness only--they employ *more* or *fewer* hands. And Alexander the Great was only *greater* than a captain of one of the Tartarian or Arabian hordes, as he was at the head of a larger number" (79). He uses the example of Alexander to drive away any thought that he should regret ruining the innocent Heartfree's family and sending him to the gallows: "I ought rather to weep with Alexander that I have ruined no more, than to regret the little I have done" (178). Wild learns to emulate the heroic masculinity not only of such historical exemplars as Alexander and Caesar, but of the most admired heroes of classical literature, as well: "He was wonderfully pleased with that passage in the eleventh Iliad when Achilles is said to have bound two sons of Priam upon a mountain and afterwards to have released them for a sum of money" (46-47). He is inspired even by the noble Nestor: "He was ravished with the account which Nestor gives in the same book of the rich booty which he bore off (i.e. stole) from the Eleans. He was desirous of having this often repeated to him, and at the end of every repetition he constantly fetched a deep sigh, and said *it was a glorious booty*" (47). The exemplary function of models of heroic masculinity is thereby put seriously into doubt. As Farrell notes, "When a literary genre associated with heroes of all times [such as Alexander, Caesar, or the Homeric heroes] presents the life of a common thief, that form becomes an ironic commentary on the traditional notion of a hero" (225). It does, indeed. And when those heroes are the models upon which the thief patterns his behaviour, the exemplary function of the "traditional notion of a hero" is seriously undermined.

Fielding does not allow readers the comfort of thinking that, while Jonathan Wild may be a poor exemplar of heroic masculinity, whatever he may think of himself, the model itself is irreproachable. Rather, he insists, the model itself is fundamentally flawed. The clearest refutation in *Jonathan Wild* of the essential soundness of the ideology of heroic masculinity is the puppet show metaphor. The narrator begins by comparing, conventionally enough, human life and activity to the drama:

> . . . the stage of the world differs from that in Drury Lane principally in this--that whereas, on the latter, the hero or chief figure is almost continually before your eyes, whilst the under-actors are not seen above once in an evening; now, on the former, the hero or great man is always

> behind the curtain, and seldom or never appears or doth anything in his own person. He doth indeed, in the GRAND DRAMA, rather perform the part of the prompter, and doth instruct the well-drest figures, who are strutting in public on the stage, what to say or do. (154)

Not satisfied with this well-worn analogy, the narrator provides another that seems more apt:

> To say the truth, a puppet-show will illustrate our meaning better, where it is the master of the show (the great man) who dances and moves everything, whether it be the King of Muscovy or whatever other potentate *alias* puppet which we behold on the stage; but he himself keeps wisely out of sight: for, should he once appear, the whole motion would be at an end. Not that any one is ignorant of his being there, or supposes that the puppets are not mere sticks of wood, and he himself the sole mover; but as this (though every one knows it) doth not appear visibly, i.e. to their eyes, no one is ashamed of consenting to be imposed upon. . . . (154)

The great man thus appears to be the initiator and controller of action, even if he himself does not--indeed, should not--act: "A GREAT MAN ought to do his business by others; to employ hands, as we have before said, to his purposes, and keep himself as much behind the curtain as possible" (155). Now, this eschewal of action is troubling enough, for should not greatness, the performance of heroic masculinity, display itself in grand and daring action? But Wild is subsequently revealed to be as much controlled as those puppets on stage whose strings he thinks he holds in his hands.

In a card game with the Count la Ruse, "his hands made frequent visits to the count's pocket before the latter had entertained any suspicion of him" (49-50), the wording and syntax of the sentence suggesting that his hands act independently of his will, as if they were controlled by an outside force or by strings. And Nokes observes that "even on the scaffold, he is subject to his ruling passion" (24):

> We must not, however, omit one circumstance, as it serves to shew the most admirable conservation of character in our hero to his last moment, which was, that whilst the ordinary was busy in his ejaculations, Wild, in the midst of the shower of stones, etc., which played upon him, applied his hands to the parson's pocket, and emptied it of his bottle-screw, which he carried out of the world in his hand. (Fielding, *Jonathan Wild* 214)

Again he acts as if by compulsion, as if controlled by a puppet-master of whose very existence he is unaware. And, fittingly enough, he ends his life dangling from a string.

The central characteristic of heroic masculinity is action: a man acts. He is not acted upon. But Fielding's puppet-show metaphor shows that men, even great men, are controlled. As a matter of fact, the greater the man, the more in thrall he is to the ideology of heroic masculinity, and the less aware he is of his enthrallment. So, paradoxically, those who most exemplify manhood by taking heroic action are in fact those who are the most passive and controlled.[73] Wild fancies himself the puppet-master, the great man who "dances and moves everything," but while his puppets may at least be aware of their role as puppets, the putative puppet-master deceives himself into believing that he alone is in control, rather than controlled.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, then, militarily-defined masculinity would seem to have been at an all-time cultural low in England. Long-standing English antimilitarism, reinforced and exacerbated by the lingering national trauma of the Civil War and the other civil and military disturbances of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, seemed to have removed military heroes permanently from the position of exemplars of ideal masculinity they formerly occupied. Then, in mid-century, things began to change, and the conditions that would make the Duke of Wellington's position as national hero and exemplar of heroic masculinity more stable than the Duke of Marlborough's had been began to develop. The Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 played a key role in the return of martial masculinity to a position of cultural centrality in Britain.

---

[73] A similar paradox--apparent heroic activity belying real passivity--lies behind the experience of shell shock among men serving in the trenches in World War One. See Chapter 6.

As epigraph to his 1933 collection and translation of Highland songs about the '45, John Lorne Campbell quotes a verse written by Alexander MacDonald[74] (Alasdair Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair):

> Unjustly they termed us
> "The Mob from the Highlands"
> We were the flower of the heroes
> Who to manly deeds trusted,
> The true kernel of valour
> When courage was proven,
> Who stout blows were a-striking
> In the red-wounding contest. (vii)

As here, Culloden was often represented as the grave of heroism, the place where, in the words of Tobias Smollett, "Thy [Scotland's] martial glory, crown'd with praise, / Still shone with undiminished blaze"(19-20) but nevertheless broke and fell: "Thy sons, for valour long renown'd, / Lie slaughter'd on their native ground" (Smollett 3-4). "Warriors proud, without fault," another Highland poet calls the Jacobite army, "struck down at the time of the onset" (John Roy Stewart [Iain Ruadh Stiubhart], "Another Song on Culloden Day" [Oran Eile Air Latha

---

[74] MacDonald (*c.* 1700-1770), first cousin of Flora MacDonald, is "generally accepted as the foremost Scottish Gaelic poet," but Campbell notes that his personal history is extraordinarily obsure (J.L. Campbell 33). Previously a schoolteacher, he was an early recruit to the Jacobite forces in 1745, was appointed to teach the Prince Gaelic, and was apparently with him for at least part of his wanderings after Culloden (J.L. Campbell 36-7). Nearly all of his poetry was composed between 1730 and 1751; fifty-eight poems are extant, many unpublished (J.L. Campbell 40 n. 3).

Chuil-Lodair"] lines 74, 76, in J.L. Campbell 176-85). The slaughter was certainly tremendous, at least in terms of total numbers present on the battlefield. While the Duke of Cumberland lost fewer than a hundred men of the 8000 in his army, Jacobite sources claim that 4000 of their men were killed (J.L. Roberts 175). John L. Roberts concludes, however, that a more likely estimate is 2500, "with 1,000 killed upon the battlefield and another 1,500 cut down in flight" (175), meaning that "of the men who actually fought for the Prince at Culloden, nearly, if not quite, half were slaughtered in the battle or in flight from it" (176). And the slaughter did not end with the battle. In the wake of the failed rebellion, 120 people were executed, about 936 transported and a further 121 banished "outside our Dominions," and 3471 taken prisoner, hundreds of whom died in prison (Daiches 217). As Roberts writes, after Culloden Cumberland was "absolutely determined, in his own words, 'to bruise those bad seeds spread about this country so as they may never shoot again'" (183). His officers moved out through the Highlands, killing, burning, and looting. Mercy, Cumberland thought, was "the prerogative of 'old women'" (McLynn 154). Their actions were aided by the fact that, as David Daiches notes, many English officers "regarded the clansmen opposing them as little more than banditti" rather than as soldiers deserving of respect (143). Allan I. Macinnes calls "the immediate aftermath of the 'Forty-Five . . . systematic state terrorism, characterised by a genocidal intent" (211). The extended repression and destruction throughout the Highlands following Culloden lived on in song and verse:

> One more tale, and I hate that 'tis true,

That is now known everywhere,
Every keen man who once served the King
Is now hunted over the moors.
Wretched carls without honour or worth,
But ready for aught for reward,
Take advantage of us everywhere–
O Christ, turn this wheel round about!

(John Roy Stewart[75] (Iain Ruadh Stiubhart], " John Roy's Prayer" ["Urnuigh Iain Ruaidh"] lines 17-24, in J.L. Campbell 186-91)

In another song, "Culloden Day" ("Latha Chuil-Lodair" in J.L. Campbell 168-75), John Roy Stewart laments the results of Cumberland's reprisals:

Woe is me! the white bodies
That lie out on yonder hillsides,
Uncoffined, unshrouded,
Not even buried in holes;

---

[75] Stewart (1700-1752) was descended from the 14th-century Alexander Stewart, the "Wolf of Badenoch," grandson of King Robert II, founder of the Stewart line. He served in the Scots Greys for a time, but resigned after being denied a commission in the Black Watch. He then served as a Jacobite agent, for which he was arrested in 1736; he escaped with the connivance of Lord Lovat (one of the Jacobite leaders executed after the '45), and spent the next years abroad (like so many Jacobites). He returned to play an important role in the '45. After Culloden he, like the Prince, spent months as a hunted fugitive with a price on his head. He managed to escape after joining the Prince in September 1746 and died abroad in 1752. Campbell describes him as "an accomplished and cultured soldier, a typical example of the romantic Jacobite," and "the only Jacobite leader who was a Gaelic poet" (165-7).

Those who survived the disaster
  Are carried to exile o'erseas by the winds,
The Whigs have got their will of us,
  And "rebels" the name that we're given.

We are under the heel of the strangers
  Great the shame and disgrace that we feel,
Our country and homes have been plundered,
  No welcome awaits us there now;
Castle Downie's in fire-blackened ruins,
  Unhonoured its bare, silent walls;
'Tis bitter indeed fortune's changing
  We have lost every comfort we had. (lines 33-48)

In "On a Late Defeat, 1746" attributed by the Reverend Robert Forbes to "a Scots gentleman, an officer in the Dutch service" (I.226-7), the speaker tells of the aftermath of Culloden with horror:

A bloody, perjur'd, mercenary crew,
Who fled but lately whom they now pursue
Like fiends of hell, by worse than demon led,
They *kill the wounded* and they rob the dead.
O! Act of horror! more than savage rage
Unparallel'd in any former age!
Curst be the barb'rous executing hand,

> And doubly curst who gave the dire command.
>
> A deed so monstrous, shocking ev'n to name,
>
> To all eternity 'twill damn their fame. (Forbes 227)

The misery of the Highlands after Culloden was severe, and it did not lessen in the telling.[76]

The villain of this phase of the Jacobite story, of course, as the above lines indicate, is William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland. Younger son of George II, Cumberland's sole claim to fame is his victory at Culloden, the only victory of his military career. His victory initially made him a popular hero in England:

> The Duke's portrait was everywhere--on sale in the streets, painted gaudily on inn-signs, smiling rosy-cheeked on mugs, almost unrecognizably transformed in classical profile on medals. Babies were christened William, Augustus or Cumberland, or perhaps all three. The latest popular dance--though not in Edinburgh, where it caused riots--was the Culloden reel. Buildings and public features were named after the Duke--Cumberland Lodge, Cumberland Place, Cumberland Terrace, Cumberland Market, innumerable Cumberland roads; and no one yet noticed anything ironical in associating the Duke with the

---

[76] Murray G.H. Pittock notes that the aftermath of Culloden and the later sufferings caused by the Highland Clearances were linked "in the popular imagination," with the one following directly from the the other, despite being separated by half a century (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 177).

> gallows when Tyburn Gate at the north-east corner of
> Hyde Park became Cumberland Gate. (Marples 179-80)

The culmination to the public rejoicing came in the autumn of 1746, when the royal family and a vast congregation gathered in St Paul's for a service of thanksgiving, for which Handel wrote "The Conquering Hero" (Prebble 236-7; Marples 182-3).

But rumours of the brutality of Cumberland's forces after the battle began circulating early, dampening the public fervour even in England. Tobias Smollett--Scottish but a Whig and certainly no supporter of the Jacobites (Knapp 57)--was moved to write "The Tears of Scotland," published despite the pleas of friends that to do so would be dangerous. Cumberland's reputation was ultimately shaped more by the losers at Culloden than by the victors. Within weeks of his victory at Culloden, Cumberland had received, even in England, the nickname by which he has since been known: the Butcher (Speck 162). In Scotland, the Reverend Robert Forbes collected accounts of atrocities attributed to him and the royal forces in ten manuscript volumes entitled *The Lyon in Mourning*,[77] which W.A. Speck calls "a mine of information for those seeking to dig up evidence that the duke of Cumberland was the 'Butcher' of legend. They are also a minefield, for many of the dark deeds which Forbes faithfully chronicled blow up if they are not handled carefully" (159). Though many of the stories that circulated in the wake of the battle and the months of searching for fugitives that followed it were untrue, they permanently shaped his representation. Alexander MacDonald (Alasdair Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair) refers to him contemptuously as "a vile stinking Dutchman" ("Another Incitement for the Gaels" ["Brosnachadh Eile Do Na Gaidheil"] line 48, in J.L. Campbell 138-43):

---

[77] These were edited and published by Henry Paton in 1895.

> O, he's the true coward
> Who's never stood firm
> Since he did the true work of a butcher
> But panic and flying
> On each field attend him,
> To strike him with feverish terror;
> May he suffer like Cain
> Unescapable fear,
> And the torture and plague of his conscience,
> May he meet a vile death
> Such as Herod obtained,
> Or his true brother, Emperor Nero. (lines 49-60)

Cumberland is thus associated with Cain, the original fratricide; with Nero, the infamously cruel and hedonistic Roman emperor; and with Herod, the instigator of the Massacre of the Innocents and the persecutor of Christ. Elsewhere MacDonald longs for both Cumberland's death and that of the Prince of Wales, his brother:

> And, if I got my yearning,
> Sorely would the Duke suffer;

You would see the vile butcher
  With the rope round his windpipe.

You would see the vile butcher
  With the rope round his windpipe,
And the Maiden I'd give
  An heirloom to his brother.
("Another Song to the Prince" ["Oran Eile Do'n Phrionnsa"]
lines 57-64, in J.L. Campbell 132-7)

In an anonymous song included in Forbes's *The Lyon in Mourning* (I.223–5), "Old Beelzebub" (stanza 2) calls Cumberland "Billy, my darling," who "can ravish, can murder, can burn, can destroy-- / . . . 'tis his nat'ral delight" (stanza 10). It is the Jacobite representation of "Butcher" Cumberland that has survived, not the initial English valorisation of the victor of Culloden. His popularity in England waned rapidly. The ongoing imprisonment and trials of rebels and the stories of atrocities in Scotland "gradually produced among men of humane temper a feeling of nausea, which crystallised into resentment against Cumberland, who had stood for severity when severity was popular, and was still thought of as its principle champion" (Marples 192). The events of 1746 were ultimately to earn Cumberland what John Prebble calls "an eternity of contempt" (204).

History is written by the winners, it is often said. But in the case of the '45, history has overwhelmingly been written by--or at least about--the losers. W.A. Speck begins his biography of the Duke of Cumberland with a defence of his project:

> This is not a tale of the losers, however, but a story of the winners. For the Hanoverians rather than the Stuarts the Forty-five was an undeniable success. Yet the success story has rarely been related. Though it is often complained that historians record successes and have little time for failures, the reverse is true of the Forty-five. (1)

The losers certainly shaped subsequent discourse about the '45 and its major figures to a remarkable degree. Whether or not one supported the Jacobite cause, the romance and glamour of it was often hard to resist.[78] And the central and most romantic figure of the whole romantic tale is its hero, for whom the villain was foil--Charles Edward Stuart, the putative Prince of Wales. Cumberland and Charles share a number of significant characteristics: both were the sons of kings (or king-claimants), they were born mere months apart and were thus both extraordinarily young for leadership at the time of the '45, and both apparently showed an early interest in things military (Marples 123-4; McLynn 24) and had a passion for the sport traditionally considered to be best suited to training warriors, the hunt (Marples 124; McLynn 47, 59). But whereas personal accounts of Charles emphasise his youth, height, sexual appeal, and charm (the latter acknowledged even by his opponents and critics), representations of Cumberland typically emphasise his severity, the severe discipline he visited on his troops, and his excessive weight (Daiches 202; Tomasson and Buist 114). Charles looked like a hero; Cumberland, his heavy body swelling to obesity in the years after Culloden, did not.

---

[78] Sir Walter Scott is the most obvious example of this confusion of sympathies in novels like *Waverley* and *Redgauntlet*. For discussion of Scott's complex representation of Jacobitism and the '45, see, for example, David Brown's *Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination* (1979), Stephanie Chidester's "Scott as Jacobite: Reason and Romance in *Kenilworth* and *The Abbot*" (1991), Claire Lamont's "Jacobite Songs as Intertexts in *Waverley* and *the Highland Widow*" (1991/3), Fiona Robertson's "Of Speculation and Return: Scott's Jacobites, John Law, and the Company of the West" (1997), and Andrew Melrose's "Writing 'The End of Uncertainty': Imaginary Law, Imaginary Jacobites and Imaginary History in Walter Scott's *Heart of Midlothian* and *Redgauntlet*" (1998).

Murray G.H. Pittock suggests a threefold categorisation of Jacobite songs: "the aggressive/active song, calling for war or opposition to the Whig state; the erotic song, portraying the absent king as lover; and the sacred lyric, in defence of Episcopacy or what can only be called Anglo-Catholicism" (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 3-4). Representations of Charles partake of all these categories: he is warrior, lover, and Christ figure or source of spiritual power. We have already seen a hint of him as Christ figure in Alexander MacDonald's "Another Incitement for the Gaels," where Cumberland is compared to Herod, the persecutor of Christ, a comparison that has resonance only if Cumberland's opponent and alter ego, Charles Edward Stuart, is assumed to be the Christ so persecuted. "Oh! God-like Man, what Angel steer'd thy Course?" asks the writer of "To his Royal Highness, Charles, Prince of Wales" in a volume published in Edinburgh late in 1745 (*A Full Collection of all Poems Upon Charles, Prince of Wales* 4). Pittock comments further on this aspect of his representation:

> Combined intimacy and aloofness served to make the returning Astraea of godlike Charles a figure even more

> intensely Christlike than his father (at least in propaganda terms). Charles was both the glorious supernaturalist hero and the incarnate poor unclothed suffering Gael: a symbol of an ideal Scotland, and a paradigm of the suffering reality. Both messiah and man of sorrows, the double dimension of Charles's campaign in reality as well as in propoganda no doubt charged it with much of the appeal it still possesses. (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 166)

"What god-like man!" gushes the author of one of the poems collected by Robert Forbes ("From the Latin of Dr. King upon the Prince's picture by J.E."; Forbes III.68). In Angus MacDonald's (Aonghas Mac Dhomhnuill) "An Incitement for the Gaels" ("Oran Brosnachaidh DoNo Gaidheil"; J.l. Campbell 10-19), Charles is "the Prince of all Christians" (line 99) whose victory will ensure that "the Church will be honoured" (line 101). Nighean Aonghais Oig Mac Donald's[79] "A Song on the Coming of Prince Charles" ("Oran Air Teachd Phrionnsa Tearlach"; J.L. Campbell 22-31) makes the connection between Charles and Christ quite explicit:

> May God keep thee successful
>   Of each day the victor;
> And all who assist thee,
>   Though it be by their swords' play,

---

[79] John Lorne Campbell writes that little is known of this poet, not even her Christian name, except that she was a member of the clan MacDonald (21).

> The Prince of Glory be with them
> For King George's dethroning. (lines 27-32)

Overtly, these lines pray that Christ, "the Prince of Glory," be with those who fight against King George, but the lines certainly suggest that the term may be applied equally to that Prince whose presence sparked the rebellion and in whose service the men fight. The author of "By a Lady, extempore, upon the ribband which the Prince wore about his head when obliged to disguise himself in a female dress under the name of Betty Burk" treats the ribbon as a sacred relic, imbued with Charles's near-divinity and prefiguring both the earthly and the heavenly crown that are his "by right divine":

> Most honoured ribband, of all else take place,
> Of greens and blues, and all their tawdry race.
> Thou wast the laurel the fair temples bound
> Of Royal Charles, for greatness so renown'd.
> Thee I'll reserve, as Heav'n reserves his crown,
> Till his rebellious foes be overthrown.
> Then in thy place a diadem shall shine
> His by his virtues, as by right divine. (Forbes I.276)

He is the sacrificial son come to do his father's will: "My Arms are open, for my Sons I bleed; / See here my Father's Royal Word,—And see / My Actions, and his Will shall still agree" ("To His Royal Highness, Charles, Prince of Wales" in *A Full Collection of all Poems Upon Charles, Prince of Wales* 7). In Alexander MacDonald's "The Song of the Clans" (Oran Nam Fineachan Gaidhealach"; J.L.

Campbell 72-85), the familiar Jacobite toast to the absent king takes on eucharistic overtones:

> Beloved loyal people
>   Now your true homage give,
> Let your eyes be moteless,
> Your hearts be true and fearless;
> The health of King James Stewart,
>   Full gladly pass it round!
> But if within you fault is hidden
>   Soil not the holy cup.
>
> Fill a toast for Charlie
> Thou rascal! fill it full!
> 'Twere an elixer splendid
> Reviving my whole nature,
> Though I were at death's door,
>   And strengthless, cheerless, pale. (lines 1-10)

Charles, like Christ, will bind up the wounds of the faithful: "But maintain your courage ready, / I myself your wounds will bind" (Alexander MacDonald, "A Certain Song" ["Oran Araid"] lines 31-2). He is characterised by his mercy, even on sinners: "Like Heaven, thou comes with Mercy in thy Eyes, / And Tears drop down when ev'n a Rebel dies" ("To His Royal Highness, Charles, Prince of Wales" in *A Full Collection of all Poems Upon Charles, Prince of Wales* 3). His coming will create a second Eden:

> When the sun with soft and fertile warmth
> His lovely beams shall shed on us;
> Dew shall cover the grass,
> Milk and honey shall be had unasked,
> Silver and gold.
> (Alexander MacDonald, "A Song Composed in the Year 1746" ["Oran a Rinneadh 'Sa Bhliadhna"] lines 26-30; J.L. Campbell 94-105)

His glance has miraculously transformative powers and his face the fearsome power of a god's: "Thy magnanimous presence would banish each weakness, / Into steel would convert our flesh's base metal, / When we eagerly gaze on thy uncovered face" (Alexander MacDonald, "Charles Son of James" ["Tearlach Ma Sheumais"] lines 15-17; J.L. Campbell 52-61). Elsewhere Charles is, as Pittock notes, "an apocalyptic figure, returning to implement a day of judgement" (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 167):

> O, sorely will this be revenged
> Upon the necks of Rebels,
> When comes our royal Prince again,
> Fierce anger in his visage;
> The edges of his brandished blades
> Down to the grass will mow them . . . .
> (Alexander MacDonald, "An Elegy on Lord Lovat" ["Oran

> Mhorair Mhic-Shiomoin"] lines 105-10; J.L. Campbell 106-15)

In passages like this, the Christ-figure merges with the warrior to create a character of supernaturally powerful masculinity.

The deity and the warrior merge also in a stanza of "Ode on the 20th of December 1746"[80] describing both his martial excellence and his Christlike magnanimity:

> How great in all the soldier's art,
> With judgment calm, with fire of heart,
>   He bade the battle glow:
> Yet greater on the conquer'd plain
> He felt each wounded captive's pain,
>   More like a friend than foe. (stanza 9; Forbes I.231)

In "A POEM on Prince CHARLES's Victory at Gladsmuir" the poet praises his martial prowess:

> While god-like CHARLES commands the glorious Wars,
> In vain Rebellion shakes her pointless Dart,
> To damp the Valour of his dauntless Heart;
> Firm like a Rock he'll stem the raging Tide,
> Till in full Triumph he victorious ride. (*A Full Collection of all Poems upon Charles, Prince of Wales* 15)

---

[80] The Prince's birthday (31 December N.S.).

The straightforward warrior representations are numerous. He is "Son of our rightful exiled King, / A mighty form which becomes armour, / The broad-sword and the bossy shield" (Alexander MacDonald, "A Song to the Prince" [Oran Do'n Phrionnsa"], lines 6-8; J.L. Campbell 48-51). War, MacDonald asserts, is his natural element. Such martial representations were aided by the fact that Charles rode with his troops, at a time when few kings or heirs to kings still did so.

Although Charles is the manly warrior, he is also the beautiful object of erotic longing:

> Though you tear our hearts out,
>   And rend apart our bosoms,
> Never shall you take Prince Charles
>   From us, till we're a-dying.
>
> (Alexander MacDonald, "The Proud Plaid" [Am Breacan Uallach"] lines 73-6; J.L. Campbell 154-63)

Here, Pittock observes, "erotic affection for the Prince is passionately expressed in terms which carry sacred overtones" (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 168). Later in the same poem, MacDonald addresses him as "My darling the young hero, / Who left us to go o'er the sea" (lines 101-2). John Roy Stewart's "Another Song on Culloden Day" begins like the lament of one whose lover has gone:

> O, in anguish I am,
> My heart's fallen to earth,
> And oft from my eyes tears are falling.

> Every pleasure has gone,
> My cheeks withered with woe,
> In this hour I will hear no good tidings
>
> Of Prince Charles my beloved . . . . (lines 1-7; J.L. Campbell
> 176-85)

In "A Waulking Song" ("Oran Luaidh No Fucaidh"; J.L. Campbell 144-153), which the reader is told was "composed by a gentleman to his sweetheart, after she had gone over the water,"Alexander MacDonald even addresses Charles as a beloved woman:

> O graceful Morag of the ringlets
> To sing thy praise is my intention.
>
> And, if thou'st gone across the ocean,
> Be not slow in thy returning. (lines 1-4)

The language of "A Waulking Song" rises to heights of startling eroticism: "Thy love has sent me mad with passion, / Keen and light the thrill runs through me" (lines 33-4). Yet the overall effect is not to feminise the Prince, for he is begged to bring with him "Maidens to waulk the red cloth firmly" (l.6)--that is, an army of French soldiers to defeat the English. In that case, asserts the poet,

> There's many a well-armed, valiant Gael
> Who'll ne'er refuse to join my darling.

Who would go with sword and target,
'Gainst cannons' mouths, but little fearing,
And would dare to march in order,
To win thy right by force if need be. (lines 49-54)

His presence, then, is a masculinising one, and will inspire an army of followers.

Of course, the longed-for beloved of such poems never did return, and the gap between the myth and the man widened as the years passed. The gap had existed since his birth, as Frank McLynn notes:

> He would be in one culture but not of it; he would be of another culture but not in it. He would grow up speaking, writing and thinking in three languages but in none of them well. His ambitions would be centred on three distant kingdoms that he had never seen. He would have to carry the role of prince without the power and deference a prince normally commands. The gap between appearance and reality would always yawn like a chasm. (5)

After his exciting escape from Scotland in September 1746, the gap would grow. A clandestine visit to London in 1750, which included a formal renunciation of Catholicism in an Anglican church in the Strand (McLynn 399), proved fruitless. Daiches writes, "There is something pathetic about this belated attempt to placate the anti-Catholic feeling which over seventy years before had been responsible for his grandfather's loss of the throne" (285). At any rate, the gesture did him no good and the return to Britain for which his followers had so longed proved remarkably anticlimactic. In his later years, the tall, slim, charming Prince became a sad man who beat his mistress (McLynn 379), quarrelled with his wife, and drank too much. As both he and the cause he represented ceased to be a real threat, his representation moved ever farther into the realm of legend.

The story of Bonnnie Prince Charlie and the '45 looks forward to the romantic militarism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But it is a militarism that increasingly existed purely in the realm of the imaginary. Whatever the romantic appeal of Charles Edward Stuart and the wild Highlanders who supported him, the form of heroic masculinity they represented clearly had little future. The antithetical pairing of Charles and Cumberland in some ways prefigures the Romantic response to Napoleon and Wellington,[ii] with the former being represented as the glamorous defeated hero in whom lay all hope for positive change, and the latter as the victorious but reactionary representative of the status quo. The identification of Charles with the Scottish nation also foreshadows the later identification of Wellington with the British nation, an identification discussed in the following chapters. Perhaps most importantly, the defeat of Jacobitism helped to make the renewed celebration of martial masculinity in Britain possible by finally banishing the spectre of internal threat from a military source. Henceforth the only military danger could come from outside not inside the body politic. The lingering trauma of the Civil War was almost entirely expunged in the collapse of Jacobitism as a genuine force after Culloden. The Civil War was a distant memory, far enough away for its horrors to seem no longer threatening. By the late eighteenth century, Jacobitism was a spent force, the succession was settled, and England was increasingly prosperous and stable. As well, Great Britain was beginning to take on a greater international role as colonial and imperial power.[82] Such a role provided an important new arena in which military men could operate, indeed almost demanded a return to militarily-defined heroic masculinity. The military hero began to seem a figure of hope and a source of national pride and aggrandisement rather than a figure of ridicule and a source of national instability, someone who would serve rather than subvert the nation. It is in this context that a hero like the Duke of Wellington could arise and, unlike his predecessor the Duke of Marlborough, retain his position as exemplar of heroic English masculinity.

[ii] This is especially true of Byron's representation of Napoleon and Wellington. See Chapter 5.

---

[82] While there is much popular literature surrounding General Wolfe and the capture of a great colonial empire by the end of the Seven Years War, the euphoric feeling about Britain's cultural identity was severely curtailed when the American colonies were lost. And once again, it could be argued that the demonic French were responsible. At any rate, the literature generated by these events is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Chapter 5

The Duke of Wellington, Romantic Heroism, and the Construction of Heroic National Manhood

"Then WELLINGTON! thy piercing eye
This crisis caught of destiny--"

Sir Walter Scott, The Field of Waterloo *(XIII.251-2)*

By the latter half of the eighteenth century, England seemed prosperous, stable, and peaceful. The Civil War was a distant memory, the Jacobite threat was a thing of the past--a sentimental archaism to those who liked still to toast the king over the water--, the succession was assured,[82] and prosperity was rising. However, the French Revolution and Napoleon's rise to power were to resurrect the spectre of war and to make the figure of the warrior once again of central cultural significance. "The twenty-six years from the fall of the Bastille to Waterloo was a period of almost unremitting war," Betty T. Bennett notes (Introduction 30), and the effects on British life and culture were enormous. "In response to forces released by the French Revolution," John Keegan writes,

---

[82] The Hanoverians may not have liked their heirs, but--unlike the later Stuarts--at least they had no trouble producing them.

"European states were progressively impelled to remilitarise their own populations" (*A History of Warfare* 50), England among them, and militarisation, in turn, impelled a hardening of gender lines, as Mary A. Favret convincingly argues: "As war presses against the public sphere, it parlays the public man into a man of war" (542). And the nation increasingly saw itself as in need of such men and the protection they could provide. Whereas in the late seventeenth and earlier eighteenth centuries the military leader had seemed a threat to national stability and order, now, as external threats to the nation from a "hostile disordered other" (Shaw 8) grew in strength, he became its guardian and protector. As was also the case with the Civil War of the mid-seventeenth century, the consequences of the French and Napoleonic Wars were not local and limited, but national and extensive. As Clive Emsler writes, "if there was a common experience shared by all Britons in the last decade of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries, it is to be found less in the changes resulting from the industrial revolution and more in the demands of war" (4). "War was the single most important fact of British life from 1793 to 1815," Betty T. Bennett similarly asserts (Preface ix), and the importance of war is inevitably reflected in the verse of these years, as well: "War was, if we take the mass of poetry of the period into account, perhaps the principal poetic subject in an age in which society was being restructured in terms of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic wars, industrialization" (Bennett, Preface ix). Earlier eighteenth-century anti-militarism, deeply rooted in English experience, gave way under this combination of forces to an enthusiastic "cult of heroism that flourished, as far as Great Britain was concerned, far more in these wars than in preceding conflicts" (Colley 257). And that cult of heroism was both distinctly gendered and enthusiastically fostered in a wide variety of cultural spheres, as Kathleen Wilson notes: "As a marker of what was desirable and necessary in the nation's leaders and citizenry, [a] masculinist version of the national character became common currency in wartime, asserted and circulated in parades, dramatic tableaux, painting, periodicals, sermons and street theatre, artifacts and design as well as the press" (37). In addition, it was rooted partly, as Linda Colley notes, in "female enthusiasm," giving rise to "intensely romantic, and often blatantly sexual fantasies" about military heroes such as Nelson and Wellington (258).[83]

The sexual appeal of the warrior hero has been axiomatic since the creation of the Greek myth of Aphrodite's adulterous affair with Ares, in which the goddess of love chooses the warrior and man of action over the less attractive but more socially useful "blacksmith god of fire and craftsmanship" (Braudy 22). That both adulterous wife and virile lover are eventually trapped and bested by the cuckolded husband does not belie the greater sexual attractiveness of the warrior. And despite a long tradition of anti-militarism in England, women there were not immune to the attraction of the martial male during the decades of the French and Napoleonic Wars. Consider, for example, the enormous statue of Achilles in Hyde Park, dedicated to the Duke by "the ladies of England" and using over thirty tons of metal from guns captured at Salamanca, Vittoria, Toulouse, and Waterloo; it was the first public male nude statue in the country. The sexual appeal of the romantic figure of the soldier preparing to fight and risk his life in perilous enterprises in distant lands against a seemingly invincible foe is indisputable. "An unprecedented number of uniformed males, marching, parading and engaging in mock battles in every region of Great Britain brought a pleasant *frisson* of excitement into many normally quiet and deeply repetitive female lives," Linda Colley notes (257). Military glamour, what Philip Shaw calls "the erotic charge of battle" (2-3), eclipses even the more practical appeal of a substantial fortune in the eyes of the younger Bennet sisters in *Pride and Prejudice*: "They could talk of nothing but officers; and Mr Bingley's large fortune, the mention of which gave animation to their mother, was worthless in their eyes when opposed to the regimentals of an ensign" (24). Those officers, even lowly ensigns, should have been proper marital prospects for girls of good family. As John Breihan and Clive Caplan point out, "the law should have guaranteed that, in financial terms at least, all of them would have been good matches for the Bennet sisters," since Parliament, "constitutionally suspicious of armies," had imposed property qualifications on all commissions in the land forces: "The idea was that only those who possessed property could be trusted to defend it, and the political and social order based upon it" (Breihan and Caplan 19-20).[84] The Duke of Wellington held similar views about the necessity for officers to have appropriate social standing, much preferring "ability with a title to ability without" (Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 275). John Keegan acknowledges that lack of proper accountability of officers who had purchased their commissions often frustrated Wellington's desire to impose discipline:

---

[83] In Nelson's case, his very public and romantic love life played a role in the eroticised response to him. And Wellington's close relationships with attractive younger women such as Mrs. Arbuthnot and Angela Burdett-Coutts, at least some of which were sexual, were well-known and the subject of frequent gossip.

> Their commissions, which they had bought, were their livelihoods. But they were equally, because private property, their defence against the displeasure of their superiors. Hence Wellington's frustrated rage against "the utter incapacity of some officers at the heads of regiments to perform the duties of their situation, and the apathy and unwillingness of others." Court-martial served no purpose, he complained, because officers would not find fellow commission-owners guilty. (*The Mask of Command* 129-30)

However, their rank, Wellington thought, told when they were in battle: "But his dissatisfactions dissolved when he brought his idlers within musket shot of the French. Then their sense of aristocratic obligation, whether their aristocratic origins were real or assumed, asserted itself in heroic style" (*The Mask of Command* 130). The ideals of heroic masculinity, in other words, still determined their conduct in battle; then they felt themselves called upon to act as warriors in accordance with their position as officers.

---

[84] Officers were also required to purchase most of their equipment and clothing, which could require a considerable financial outlay. When Sir Walter Scott's eldest son, also named Walter, entered the 18th Hussars as a Cornet (colour-bearer) in 1819, his commission cost his father £750, his uniform and equipment about £360 and horses an additional £200 (E. Johnson I.682). That was an enormous sum to pay, Scott commented, "for the privilege of getting the hardness of his skull tried by a brick-bat at the next meeting of Radical Reformers" (qtd by E. Johnson I.682). Subsequent rises in the ranks and moves to other regiments required comparable outlays of funds from Scott.

The demands of the wars of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries caused a shortage of officers that "induced Parliament annually to indemnify those who failed to qualify. By 1795, Pitt told the Commons that no qualifications could realistically be applied to the junior officers in the militia" (Breihan and Caplan 20). Accordingly, in the words of J.R. Western, "the lieutenants and ensigns were frankly a disgrace. There was only one really copious source of supply: needy individuals in search of a living and youths of impecunious family who wanted a military career on the cheap" (314). Austen's portrayal of Wickham, then, is solidly rooted in reality. She clearly depicts the dangers and disruptions caused in a quiet country neighbourhood by billeted officers: social change, threats to public order, seductions of easily influenced local girls (Lydia Bennet being an obvious case in point), and financial and other disruptions due to the practice of quartering.[85] This traditional means of housing troops in a civilian neighbourhood broke down badly under the stresses of increased war demands from the 1790s (Breihan and Caplan 20-22).

The most admired military heroes in England during these decades were, of course, Nelson and Wellington. Nelson, being a naval hero, was in rather a different category than Wellington: "Unlike generals, who never entirely escaped the stigma of the standing army in the eighteenth century, admirals were among Britannia's most cherished guardians, the seaborne defenders of king, constitution, and country" (Jordan and Rogers 202). Derek Jarrett agrees:

---

[85] For a recent examination of Austen's criticism of military culture and values in this novel, see Tim Fulford's "Sighing for a Soldier: Jane Austen and Military Pride and Prejudice" (2002).

> The island history of Britain had fostered a belief that seapower, unlike military power, was an attribute of liberty rather than a danger to it. The seamen were the real defenders of the island fortress, standing on the battlements (or perhaps in the moat itself, for the sake of a consistent metaphor) and facing outwards against the foe. Soldiers, on the other hand, were the cowardly bullies who ran around inside the fortress harrying its civilian occupants under the pretence of organizing a defence in which they themselves were careful to take very few risks. (45)

The Duke of Wellington came closer to escaping that stigma than any general in English history, however, certainly far closer than the leader to whom he was most regularly compared, the Duke of Marlborough. Wellington became regarded as "perhaps the most perfect embodiment of the gentlemanly ideal England has ever produced" (Keegan, *The Mask of Command* 142). Like Marlborough, he was celebrated for his military victories, and like Marlborough he was attacked by political opponents and a highly politicised press, but unlike

Marlborough he was able to maintain and consolidate his position as exemplar of heroic national masculinity.

Comparisons of Wellington to Marlborough became common during the Peninsular War. After Wellington's[*] victory at Bussaco (27 September 1810), his younger brother William wrote to him in anticipation of a great follow-up victory:

> If you conquer--Europe--the World may be saved. If you are defeated Portugal is lost--probably Spain--certainly Ireland most likely Great Britain--and the Continent must be Bonaparte's. Conquer them, and notwithstanding the habitual [in]gratitude of the United Kingdom, you must be a second Marlboro'. (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 290)

Hester Thrale Piozzi also connects the two men in a letter about the bloody siege of Badajoz (16 March to 6 April 1812): "Genl. Donkin says it was a glorious sight--the storming of Badajoz; and that old John Duke of Marlbro' would have rejoiced to see the Courage of our officers & men" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 339). Not only the English considered Marlborough the standard by which Wellington's greatness was to be measured; of Wellington's victory at

---

[*] Arthur Wellesley was not created Duke of Wellington until 3 May 1814, but "Wellington" had been part of his title since 4 September 1809, when he was created Viscount Wellington of Talavera (Talavera being the site of one of his Peninsular victories). Since he has become known to posterity as the Duke of Wellington, that title will be used throughout to refer to him.

Salamanca (22 July 1812), which proved a crucial step in driving the French out of the Peninsula, the French general Maximilien Foy wrote in his diary, "It raises Wellington's reputation almost to the level of Marlborough" (qtd by A. Roberts 89). In a letter of 1813, as Wellington's forces crossed the Pyrenees into France, the future Louis XVIII also admiringly compared Wellington to Marlborough, "strange praise from a great-great-grandson of Louis XIV," Philip Guedalla wryly comments (245). Even Napoleon himself, while in exile on St Helena, called him "the modern Marlborough" (qtd by A. Roberts 225). The comparisons between the two military heroes continued through to the end of Wellington's military career; one of his officers also described him at Waterloo as "our modern Marlborough" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 546). Usually, as in these examples, the comparison implies a standard of greatness towards which Wellington is moving or against which he might be measured, and the sense of destiny in a passage such as that in William Wellesley's letter, quoted above, is palpable: like Marlborough, Wellington is the bulwark against (French-created) disaster, and if he fails, all else fails with him. Marlborough represents the legacy of heroic English manhood that Wellington must live up to, although Marlborough himself could not.

At other times, the comparison is more evaluative, with either Marlborough or Wellington being found wanting. An officer at the Battle of Salamanca wrote in a letter home of Wellington's "Laconic Speeches" to his divisional commanders that they were "not the language of the Marlboroughs," but "it is very much the modern Hero's style of addressing his Generals and is found to answer equally well" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 353). Here Wellington's manner of speech (and he has often been criticised for the abruptness, coolness, and terseness of his communications with his officers[57]) is contrasted with the presumably more courtly and polished speech one might expect of Marlborough, the elegant courtier. In this rougher modern age, Wellington's abruptness is deemed characteristic and functional, if not elegant.

Another evaluative comparison, this time to Marlborough's disadvantage, was made by the Duchess of Wellington on her deathbed and comes to us via her friend and distant cousin Maria Edgeworth. On her deathbed, Edgeworth writes, the Duchess "exclaimed with weak voiced strong souled enthusiasm 'All tributes to merit--there is the value! and pure! pure!--no corruption--ever *suspected* even. Even of the Duke of Marlborough that could not be said so truly'" (Edgeworth 476). The Wellesleys' marriage had been troubled and distant from the beginning[illegible] (another point on which Wellington differs greatly from Marlborough, whose continued and lifelong devotion to his difficult wife[illegible] was renowned), and Edgeworth comments on this deathbed declaration:

---

[57] Historian Andrew Roberts writes of Wellington's remarkably restrained despatches that it is "small wonder that Wellington has been accused of emotional constipation" (89). Even his descendant, the seventh Duke of Wellington, admits that "No one can pretend that the Duke was one of the great letter-writers. His letters are often heavy and prosy" (Wellesley vii). John Keegan speaks more positively of Wellington's communication style. He quotes and comments on a note written by Wellington in the thick of battle at Waterloo dealing with the threatened situation at Hougoumont, a walled farmhouse in which fierce fighting raged all day: "'I see that the fire has communicated from the haystack to the roof of the chateau. You must however still keep your men in those parts to which the fire does not reach. Take care that no men are lost by the falling in of the roof, or floors. After they will have fallen in, occupy the ruined walls inside of the garden, particularly if it should be possible for the enemy to pass through the embers to the inside of the House.' Wellington's clarity of mind and conciseness of expression were famed. To have written such purposeful and accurate prose (the note contains both a future subjunctive and future perfect construction), on horseback, under enemy fire, in the midst of a raging military crisis is evidence of quite exceptional powers of mind and self-control" (*The Mask of Command* 98).

> The fresh untired enthusiasm she feels for his character--for her own still youthful imagination of her hero--after all she has gone through is quite wonderful! most touching. There she is fading away--living to the last still feeding when she can feed on nothing else on his glories on the

---

[illegible] They married in 1806, in what Philip Guedalla calls "in some ways the most obscure of all his actions" (125). A brief relationship between them in Dublin had ended in the refusal of his proposal of marriage in 1793, her family having had no desire to ally themselves to an impecunious younger son of a large and impecunious family. In the intervening years, during which Arthur Wellesley rose to a position of some importance and gained considerable wealth as a result of his campaigns in India, the couple apparently had no contact at all. Queen Charlotte famously asked her, again as reported by Maria Edgeworth, "Did you really never write one letter to Sir Arthur Wellesley during his long absence?" "No, never, Madame." "And did you never think of him?" "Yes, Madame, very often" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 164-5). But he returned to find that she and her family and friends expected a renewal of his addresses, and he fell in with their wishes. "I married her," he wrote to his friend Mrs. Arbuthnot in 1822, "because they asked me to do it & I did not know myself. I thought I should never care for anybody again, & that I shd. be with my army &, in short, I was a fool" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 163). When he first saw her again, having already promised in writing to marry her, he whispered to his brother Gerald, who was to perform the ceremony, "She has grown ugly by Jove" (qtd by Hibbert 57). Their difficult and distant marriage was quite in accord with this inauspicious beginning.

[illegible] Sarah's temper and volatility, her quarrels with those around her--including the workmen at Blenheim, her own children, and (the most fraught with ill consequences) the Queen--are an essential part of her character. In a famous incident, she chopped off her long hair in a fit of rage when her husband informed her at the last minute that he had invited someone to dinner without telling her (Field 105). For recent studies of the Duchess, see Virginia Cowles's *The Great Marlborough and his Duchess* (1983) and Ophelia Field's *The Favourite: Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough* (2002).

> perfume of his incense as fairies live on perfumes of less intellectual kind. (Edgeworth 476)

Certainly, Marlborough was dogged by accusations of avarice and corruption, particularly in the last years of his command, although those accusations had more to do with political malice and machination than with reality, but Wellington--as both military commander and politician--was respected for his probity even by those who most disliked or disagreed with him.

So why was Marlborough's position as national hero to prove so tenuous and Wellington's so enduring? Much of the explanation lies in the differing circumstances of their times. Marlborough came to prominence in a country still scarred by civil war, at a time of profound distrust of military leaders and the potential danger they posed to national stability. Wellington, on the other hand, achieved his prominence at a time when the nation had long been prosperous and stable, when its well-being was threatened not by internal dissension or the clashing ambitions of the powerful, as in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but by external and clearly foreign forces; the military hero was then no threat to the British nation, but the protector, even the extender, of it, especially after Waterloo:

> [T]hroughout the last two centuries, the battle was represented, with very little equivocation, as a resounding British triumph, symbolic not only of the defeat of French tyranny but also of the inevitable rise to power of a non-aggressive, anti-expansionist and, most dazzlingly of all,

> anti-Imperial mode of Empire. Linked to the bluff facade of a nation secure in its right to govern the world is the critical role played by the Duke of Wellington. (P. Shaw 2)

Marlborough and his early eighteenth-century victories were simply not amenable to this sort of national myth-making.

Also, although Wellington was subject to criticism in the public press, the press in his time, as a result of the extremely conservative reaction to the French Revolution and the libertarian ferment on the continent, enjoyed far less freedom to vilify him or other public figures than it had in Marlborough's time, as John Feather points out in *A History of British Publishing*:

> The press which had proliferated in nearly a century of freedom from control was now seen as a danger to the very foundations of the state. In the late 1790s, Pitt's government armed itself with a weapon which was, in its way, as draconian as any of the laws of the Tudors or the Stuarts. This was the Seditious Societies Act of 1799, which required, *inter alia*, the registration of all presses and printing types, the inclusion of the printer's name on all printed matter and the maintenance by each printer of a complete file of all his products which the Justices of the Peace could inspect on demand. It was a climax to the eighteenth century which was as untypical as it was unexpected, and unlike so many previous attempts it did

> actually succeed in controlling the press to a very considerable extent. Indeed, the opposition newspaper press, at least in London, was virtually eliminated by the end of the century. (91-2)

Public attacks on Marlborough's character and conduct had been politically inspired, a tool of party politics, and could be made with little or no restraint or fear of consequences. Attacks on Wellington, on the other hand, could be read as sedition and subject to serious penalties in the reactionary political climate of the time. The great appeal of mudslinging, as politicians and journalists know, is that some of it eventually sticks. A very great deal was thrown at Marlborough in the last years of his command, and public perception of his status as national hero suffered accordingly. Largely as a result of the altered reactionary political climate in the wake of the French Revolution, a great deal less mud was slung at Wellington a century later, and those attacks that were made seemed more anomalous and made less of an impact on the public, who were exposed to far more panegyric than invective. Wellington's status as national hero therefore suffered far less diminution, even from such attacks as were made. His personal reserve and reticence added to the continuing perception of him as unassailably heroic.

Another part of the explanation lies in the differing trajectories of their military careers. Marlborough, after years of waiting and serving in minor commands, was finally granted command of the Allied forces in 1702 and burst onto the European stage with the brilliant victory at Blenheim in 1704; faced with stubbornly resistant allies and increasing political and court opposition at home, Marlborough was unable to capitalise fully on his later victories (Ramillies in 1706, Oudenarde in 1708, Malplaquet in 1709), which became progressively less decisive in the political and eventually the military arenas, and the war ended in a treaty far less advantageous to British interests than the early victories had led them to expect. Furthermore, his great enemy, Louis XIV, emerged--if not victorious--at least with his power still intact. Wellington's military career, in contrast, followed a steadily upward trajectory, as he racked up victories in India and then, against the expectations of many, in the Peninsula; his career as general culminated, of course, in the grand victory at Waterloo, which saw the great enemy finally and incontrovertibly defeated and forced from power. Had Napoleon not escaped from Elba in early 1815 and risen again to threaten Europe, Wellington would perhaps have remained simply one general, however skilled, among the Allies who jointly brought about the emperor's abdication in 1814 (with Napoleon's own hubris contributing mightily to his downfall, especially as a result of his disastrous invasion of and retreat from Russia). After all, Wellington had never even faced his and his nation's great enemy on the battlefield. But Napoleon's dramatic escape from Elba, and his Hundred Days of freedom, ending in the clash of the titans[90] --their first and last military meeting[91]

---

[90] Wellington later spoke of his single military encounter with Napoleon in similar terms: "But two such armies as those at Waterloo have seldom met, if I may judge from what they did on that day. It was a battle of giants! A battle of giants!" (qtd in A. Roberts 168).

[91] They never, of course, met personally.

—at Waterloo and the decisive and incontrovertible destruction of his power after a long day in which the outcome remained in doubt almost to the very end provided the narrative of Wellington's generalship with a fittingly dramatic climax that Marlborough's lacked. Wellington's biographer Elizabeth Longford writes that he was "lucky" (wise might be closer to the truth) to end his career as an active commander at 46, "during his prime while he looked taller than his 5 feet 9 inches, while his complexion was still as fresh as a young man's, his forehead romantic and his expression like a Roman hero's" (*Pillar of State* 58)--in other words, while he still looked very much the part of a national warrior hero. Marlborough's enemy retained his throne, while Wellington's was toppled from his; Marlborough ended his years as military hero in disgrace and banishment, and Wellington in triumph and international acclaim. Marlborough's victories left England in a position less markedly different than the scale of his victories had led people to expect, while Wellington's successes in the Peninsula and final victory at Waterloo ushered in a century of unprecedented British power and prestige on the continent and beyond. Wellington's was a far more appealing narrative of national triumph in the face of looming disaster, and the hero of that narrative could more easily be represented in uncomplicatedly heroic and triumphant terms.

Moreover, whereas Marlborough's years of ascendancy occurred at a time when the dominant literary modes were the comic, the satiric, and the mock-heroic, Wellington came to prominence at a time when the dominant literary and artistic movement was Romanticism, and many Romantics (though by no means all) celebrated the martial and the heroic. Nancy L. Rosenblum describes "romantic militarism" as

> a widespread European intellectual phenomenon that made its appearance at the time of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, and the European reaction. It was the invention of romantic writers who were not always passionate about politics or inclined to real aggression but who wrote about war as *the* way to enforce justice and as *the* occasion for self-expression. (249)

She distinguishes romantic militarism from ordinary militarism, "which assumes the social importance of exclusively military virtues and privileges," and from "the more common prosaic love of war with its attachment to the exhilaration of combat, the comforts of *esprit de corps*, and homoeroticism" (249), both of which were at any rate less strong in England than they were on the continent; she points instead to romantic militarism's "thoroughgoing attack on life in the modern state. It is anti-institutional and anti-bourgeois" (249). Tim Travers contrasts the "detached, uninvolved quality of the writing" in military memoirs of the Marlborough campaigns with the memoirs of the French and Napoleonic Wars:

> However, with the Napoleonic War period (1790s-1815), there emerges the romanticized British military memoir, emphasizing the horrors of war with graphic and

> exaggerated descriptions; and romantic descriptions of life, love, travel and battle scenes in exotic locations. A military genre of literature [informed by romantic militarism] is now established for the new reading public of the middle classes, for example, the military titles put out by the publishers Colburn and Bentley. (156-7)

Romantic militarism was communicated through such means to ordinary readers to shape subsequent attitudes to war and the heroes who fought them, thereby creating an environment in which the military hero, such as Wellington, could be celebrated in a way not possible in England in the early eighteenth century at the time of Marlborough's ascendancy.

Among the institutions romantic militarism opposes, paradoxically enough, is the military, with its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and subordination of the individual will to collective action. And romantic militarism, the worship of heroic action, existed alongside a strong anti-war strain among Romantics such as Shelley. Anti-war sentiments among liberals and radicals would survive the triumphant mood after Waterloo, and Leigh Hunt was to take direct aim at Wellington in *Some Remarks on War and Military Statesman*, appended to his 1835 anti-war poem *Captain Sword and Captain Pen*, the object of which was "to show the horrors of war, the false ideas of power produced in the mind of its leaders, and, by inference, the unfitness of those leaders for the government of the world" (Hunt 49). Hunt questions the salutary masculinising effect of the military on the nation: "To those who tell us that nations would grow cowardly and effeminate without war, we answer, 'Try a reasonable condition of peace first, and then prove it'" (Hunt 66-7). He explicitly refuses the equation of military and public service so essential to Wellington's representation: "Soldiership appears to have narrowed or hardened the public spirit of every man who has spent the chief part of his life in it, who has died at an age which gives final proofs to its tendency, and whose history is thoroughly known" (Hunt 85). And he quotes Jeremy Bentham to attack decisively the exemplary function of the military hero:

> Of all that is pernicious in admiration, the admiration of heroes is the most pernicious; and how delusion should have made us admire what virtue should teach us to hate and loathe, is among the saddest evidences of human weakness and folly. . . . Our schoolmasters, and the immoral books they so often put into our hands, have inspired us with an affection for heroes; and the hero is more heroic in proportion to the numbers of the slain. . . . (Hunt 94-6)

Hunt's position is therefore as distant from that of the panegyrists who glorified Wellington as it is from that of writers influenced by romantic militarism, such as Byron, who condemned him. Byron, whatever his attraction to heroic military glory, despised the "*mercenary* Soldier" as a "*Slave of Blood*" (*Letters and Journals* I.118) whose freedom is infringed by being bound to an economic relationship

(Webb 44). Despite this, Byron's life and works support Rosenblum's assertion that war and combat seemed to many Romantics to provide the "single mode of action commensurate with their infinite energies and unlimited capacities" (250).

Byron's long and passionate involvement with the Greek struggle for independence exemplifies romantic militarism. Timothy Webb writes of Byron's Greek expedition that it "illustrates more graphically than any other episode in his life a serious commitment to the struggle for political liberty and to the principles of freedom" (44). It also usefully illustrates what Rosenblum says of romantic militarism, as is evident from even a minor piece such as his "Translation of the Famous Greek War Song":

> Then manfully despising
>   The Turkish tyrant's yoke,
> Let your country see you rising,
>   And all her chains are broke.
> Brave shades of chiefs and sages,
>   Behold the coming strife!
> Hellénes of past ages,
>   Oh, start again to life!
> At the sound of my trumpet, breaking
>   Your sleep, oh, join with me!
> And the seven-hill'd city seeking,
>   Fight, conquer, till we're free.

Sparta, Sparta, why in slumbers
　Lethargic dost thou lie?
Awake, and join thy numbers
　With Athens, old ally! (*Poems* 60; lines 9-24)

War, armed struggle, is, as the first lines of the quoted passage proclaim, the ultimate proof of manliness, both for an individual and for a people. The poem also makes clear that war for Byron is "*the* way to enforce justice" (Rosenblum 249) for the Greeks suffering under Turkish rule, and *the* means of overcoming "the longing associated with *anomie*" (Rosenblum 250): it promises to bring the dead to life and awaken the lethargic and sleeping to action.[92] Elsewhere Byron writes scornfully of "the miserable happiness of a stationary & unwarlike mediocrity" (qtd by Webb 41), from which war can only be seen as a welcome reprieve and a stimulant to greatness. Although Byron frequently criticised the modern practice of war and its heroes, he "always retained a feeling for the heady simplicities of action and for the chivalric certainties of an ancient world"

---

[92] John Keegan notes that "at the heart of Philhellenism," of which Byron was initially a believer, as this poem indicates, "lay the belief that the modern Greeks were, under their dirt and ignorance, the same people as the ancient Greeks" (*A History of Warfare* 10-11). Byron's "discovery that they were invincible only in their ignorance of rational tactics depressed and disillusioned him" (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 10), as it did other Philhellenes, as well: "But Philhellenes who shared a battlefield with Greeks not only rapidly abandoned their belief in the common identity of ancients and moderns; among those who survived to return to Europe, 'almost without exception', writes William St Clair, the historian of Philhellenism, 'they hated the Greeks with a deep loathing, and cursed themselves for their stupidity in having been deceived'. . . . [T]he Philhellenes were reduced to concluding that only a break in the bloodline between ancient and modern Greeks could explain the collapse of a heroic culture" (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 11).

(Webb 43), a feeling which is in accord with Rosenblum's delineation of romantic militarism. Although Webb admits that Byron may be seen as an early exemplar of romantic militarism, he asserts that Byron "was too much of a realist in his reading of human nature and too prone to the antinomies of self-contradiction to subscribe unreservedly to such a philosophy" (72). Byron's bitter condemnation of war and its horrors in Cantos VII to IX of *Don Juan* certainly provides an effective counter to any idea that Byron was simply an enthusiast for all things military. Yet he himself "ultimately could not resist the trumpet call of freedom in the cause of Greek independence" (Webb 72). Nor, despite his frequent condemnation of the carnage of battle, could he wholly resist the glamour of manly striving that finds its ultimate expression in war.

Byron's extended treatment in the third canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* of the Battle of Waterloo--"this place of skulls" (*Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* III.xviii.1), so overflowing with carnage that it makes the recording angels throw "their pens down in divine disgust-- / The page was so besmear'd with blood and dust" (*The Vision of Judgment* V.7-8)--is remarkable chiefly for its complete refusal to acknowledge Wellington's role in it. For Byron, Waterloo is important mostly for two things: it marked the triumph of repression and monarchical government over the hopes for liberation and freedom, and it was the occasion for the final fall of Napoleon, the great Romantic hero and all-conquering warrior:

> There sunk the greatest, nor the worst of men,
> Whose spirit, antithetically mixt,

> One moment of the mightiest, and again
> On little objects with like firmness fixt;
> Extreme in all things! hadst thou been betwixt,
> Thy throne had still been thine, or never been;
> For daring made thy rise as fall: thou seek'st
> Even now to re-assume the imperial mien,
> And shake again the world, the Thunderer of the scene!
> (III.xxxvi)

The figure of Napoleon is central to Byron's treatment of the battle of Waterloo in this section of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, although, like Wellington, he is not named. As Timothy Webb notes, though, he is regularly "signalled or invoked by periphrastic sonorities" (56), such as "Thunderer of the Scene." "'Thunderer,'" Webb argues, "seems to carry a resonance which might be described as Homeric; conventionally, the noun was sometimes used to signify a 'resistless warrior' (as the Oxford English Dictionary puts it), but Byron would not have forgotten that in the *Iliad* it is associated with Zeus" (56). Napoleon looms over these stanzas like a god toppled from his throne by lesser beings, smiling "with a sedate and all-enduring eye," standing heroically "unbow'd beneath the ills upon him piled" (III.xxxix.7, 9). Napoleon's Zeus-like position is explicit in these lines:

> He who ascends to mountain-tops shall find
> The loftiest peaks most wrapt in clouds and snow;
> He who surpasses or subdues mankind,

> Must look down on the hate of those below.
> Though high *above* the sun of glory glow,
> And far *beneath* the earth and ocean spread,
> *Round* him are icy rocks, and loudly blow
> Contending tempests on his naked head,
> And thus reward the toils which to those summits led. (III.xlv)

He may not be openly named in these stanzas, but he dominates them like an omnipotent Being.

It is not surprising that Napoleon should have fascinated, and troubled, the English Romantics. Simon Bainbridge argues that he

> was crucial to their thinking about their own roles and their acts of self-conception. They both identified with him, appropriating him as a figure of power, and used him as an *Other* against which they could define themselves. Napoleon was the supreme embodiment of the hero. . . . (*Napoleon and English Romanticism* 1-2)

This was particularly true of Byron: "Napoleon dominated Byron's imagination like no other contemporary political figure, both satisfying and frustrating his characteristic craving for the heroic" (Bainbridge, *Napoleon and English Romanticism* 135). In *Don Juan* Byron writes that he himself was "reckoned a considerable time / The grand Napoleon of the realms of rhyme" (XI.55.7-8). He sometimes signed himself "Noel Byron," so as to share the initials of Napoleon Bonaparte (Webb 59). For his theatrical departure from England in 1816 after public opinion turned against him, he commissioned a large, extravagant coach copied from one captured from Napoleon and put on display in London (Marchand 232; Root 151). These and other similarly flamboyant gestures strongly suggest an intended "equivalence between Napoleon's military and his own personal catastrophe" (Root 151). Bainbridge points out that the identification between Byron and Napoleon is fraught with tension, never simple: "Byron's representation of himself in terms of Napoleon is at once heroic and mock-heroic, or, to use a Napoleonic formulation that Byron used for himself, simultaneously sublime and ridiculous" (*Napoleon and English Romanticism* 135).

That tension became particularly significant as Napoleon's fortunes declined with surprising rapidity. Byron felt "bitter disillusionment . . . once Napoleon actually abdicated" in 1814 (Root 155), because he had counted on him, "whatever his shortcomings, to break through the cyclical round of historical repetition to create something new" (Root 158). "I mark this day!" he wrote in his journal. "Napoleon Buonaparte has abdicated the throne of the world. . . . Alas! this imperial diamond hath a flaw in it, and is now hardly fit to stick in a glazier's pencil:--the pen of the historian won't rate it worth a ducat" (*Letters and Journals* III.256-7). Even in the midst of his disillusionment, he could not bring himself to give up all hope: "But I won't give him up even now; though all his admirers have, 'like the Thanes, fallen from him'" (*Letters and Journals* III.257). His hopes and his bitter disappointment are clear in a letter to Annabella Milbanke on 20 April 1814:

> Buonaparte has fallen--I regret it--& the restoration of the despicable Bourbons--the triumph of tameness over talent--and the utter wreck of a mind which I thought superior even to Fortune--it has utterly confounded and baffled me--and unfolded more than "was dreamt of in my philosophy." (*Letters and Journals* IV.101)

In a journal entry he again makes clear that Napoleon's abdication is to him much more than the fall of an individual, however extraordinary; it is a blow to the foundations of his own worldview:

> *Vide* Napoleon's last twelvemonth. It has completely upset my system of fatalism. I thought, if crushed, he would have fallen, when "*fractus illabitur obis*," and not have been pared away to gradual insignificance;--that all this was not a mere *jeu* of the gods, but a prelude to greater changes and mightier events. But Men never advance beyond a certain point;--and here we are, retrograding to the dull, stupid old system,--balance of Europe--poising straws upon king's noses, instead of wringing them off! (*Letters and Journals* III.218)

"To exit in an apocalyptic blaze of glory" would have seemed to him and other Romantic admirers of Napoleon more fitting, but "the seeming anticlimax of his exit from the world stage" (Bainbridge, *Napoleon and English Romanticism* 141) left Byron "utterly bewildered and confounded" (Byron, *Letters and Journals* III.256).

His disappointment is most clearly articulated in "Ode to Napoleon Bonaparte" (1814), in which he who was "but yesterday a King! / And arm'd with Kings to strive" is now become "a nameless thing: / So abject--yet alive!" (I.1-4). Having dared so much, could he now dare so little, cling so pitifully to life? In bitter disillusionment the poet cries, "And Earth hath spilt her blood for him, / Who thus can hoard his own!" (X.1-2). His death, the poet asserts, would have brought forth new life and new hope for freedom: "If thou hadst died as honour dies, / Some new Napoleon might arise, / To shame the world again" (XI.5-7). But his mere life, now that power and honour and hope are defeated and dead, renders emulation of his heroic over-reaching uninspiring: "But who would soar the solar height, / To set in such a starless night?" (XI.8-9).

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Byron should have greeted news of Napoleon's escape from Elba on 26 February 1815 with such delight: "When Napoleon lived up to [his] hope by escaping from Elba, Byron was so relieved and pleased that he forgave 'the rogue for utterly falsifying every line of [his] ode.' In reversing his fortunes, Napoleon proved once again that he was above them" (Root 158), just as a hero should be. In his journal Byron exulted over this dazzling turn of events that so renewed his hopes:

> It is impossible not to be dazzled and overwhelmed by his character and career. Nothing ever so disappointed me as his abdication, and nothing could have reconciled me to him but some such revival as his recent exploit; though no one could have anticipated such a complete and brilliant

renovation. (*Letters and Journals* IV.284-5)

The Battle of Waterloo, then, represented for Byron a shocking and final dashing of his renewed hopes, and so it is not surprising that he should view it not as a victory but as an appalling defeat, and that he should view its hero, the Duke of Wellington, as the spoiler of a greatness that was beyond Wellington's own conception or achievement. While Byron recognised Napoleon's failings, he seems to have regarded those very failings as part and parcel of his greatness, as virtually inevitable products of his Romantic over-reaching. Viewing Napoleon as he did, Byron could not but regard Waterloo "as a catastrophe because it brought about the final defeat of the Promethean hero who might have accomplished so much for European liberty" (Webb 60). Byron's passionate admiration of Napoleon did not completely prevent him from recognising the Emperor's destructive effect on liberty in Europe, although he kept hoping for something better. The internal contradiction in his attitude is clear in a journal entry of November 1813: "Ever since I defended my bust of him at Harrow against the rascally time-servers, when the war broke out in 1803, he has been a 'Héros de Roman' of mine--on the continent; I don't want him here" (*Letters and Journals* III.210). The obvious contradiction between Byron's love of liberty and his admiration of Napoleon and lament for his fall was noted by Sir Walter Scott in his review of the last cantos of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* in October 1816: "Does he now compare to the field of Cannæ the plain of Waterloo, and mourn over the fall of the tyrant and the military satraps and slaves whose arms built his power, as over the fall of the cause of liberty?" (93). For many radicals or critics of English government, the fall of Napoleon was cause for mourning largely because it meant the triumph of England, especially of its more reactionary elements.

For most of his compatriots, however, the victory at Waterloo was cause for boundless rejoicing:

> As historical commentators are fond of reminding us, the battle of Waterloo . . . brought to a dramatic close one of the lengthiest periods of conflict in the history of Western Europe. When a few days later news of the Allied victory over Napoleon reached London, the effect was electric: heads of state wept, official business was suspended and crowds thronged the streets; some, like the artist Benjamin Robert Haydon, read and reread Lord Wellington's *Despatch*, hoping to find, in the words on the page, a focus for their wildest imaginings. (P. Shaw ix)

Byron did not share in this general rejoicing. From his point of view, Wellington at Waterloo not only brought down Byron's hero, but he also returned Europe to its former state of vassalage and monarchical tyranny: "What! shall reviving Thraldom again be / The patch'd-up idol of enlighten'd days?" (*Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* III.xix.5-6). "Every hope of a republic is over," he lamented in a letter to Thomas Moore on 7 July 1815, "and we must go on under the old system" (*Letters and Journals* IV.302). Wellington, on the other hand, saw the end of Napoleon's power, the subsequent restoration of stability in France, and the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne as necessary for "the end of Europe's misery" (Longford, *Pillar of State* 14).[93] Most Europeans, and certainly most Britons, agreed with him, but for Byron Wellington was the spoiler of great hopes and thus merits no mention at all in *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*:

> In *Childe Harold* meditations on the battlefield had led to an extended engagement with the antithetical qualities of Napoleon which was suffused by Byron's regret for the lost hero; by contrast, Wellington was completely excluded from the consideration of the battle which he was popularly reputed to have won and for which he had been generously rewarded by a grateful nation. (Webb 60-61)

Indeed, the generosity of that reward is one of the targets of Byron's satire in his most extended poetic treatment of Wellington, the opening stanzas of Canto IX of *Don Juan*. Timothy Webb notes that these stanzas "initiate a fiercely satirical investigation of the cost of Waterloo both to the British people and to the cause of Liberty" (62).

> Though Britain owes (and pays you too) so much,

---

[93] He had not always thought so, however. At one point he even considered that returning Napoleon to the throne--with strictly limited military capacity and powers--would be best. But after the Congress of Vienna had settled on legitimacy as the best criterion for determining the occupancy of thrones and the British Cabinet had endorsed the same principle, Wellington supported it also (Longford, *Pillar of State* 14). By the beginning of 1818, however, he foresaw that "the descendants of Louis XV will not reign in France" owing to the influence on the king of the reactionary ultra-Royalists (qtd by Longford, *Pillar of State* 46). He was right: in 1830 Charles X was driven from the throne for attempting to return France to the absolutist pre-Revolutionary state.

Yet Europe doubtless owes you greatly more,
You have repaired Legitimacy's crutch,
A prop not quite so certain as before.
The Spanish and the French, as well as Dutch,
Have seen and felt how strongly you restore.
And Waterloo has made the world your debtor
(I wish your bards would sing it rather better).

You are 'the best of cutthroats'. Do not start;
The phrase is Shakespeare's and not misapplied.
War's a brain-spattering, windpipe-slitting art,
Unless her cause by right be sanctified.
If you have acted once a generous part,
The world, not the world's masters, will decide,
And I shall be delighted to learn who,
Save you and yours, have gained by Waterloo? (IX.3-4)

Wellington is paid not only in material goods, but in words of praise and eulogy, to which the poet refuses to contribute:

I am no flatterer. You've supped full of flattery.
They say you like it too; 'tis no great wonder.
He whose whole life has been assault and battery
At last may get a little tired of thunder
And swallowing eulogy much more than satire, he

May like being praised for every lucky blunder,
Called saviour of the nations--not yet saved,
And Europe's liberator--still enslaved. (IX.5)

Wellington is thus tainted, in Byron's eyes, both by his apparent willingness to capitalise on his military success for personal and family aggrandisement and by his failure to capitalise on his success to bring about political change in Europe:

Never had mortal man such opportunity,
  Except Napoleon, or abused it more.
You might have freed fallen Europe from the unity
  Of tyrants and been blest from shore to shore. (IX.9.1-4)

Of course, many in Europe, even in France--and certainly in Great Britain--viewed Wellington as a deliverer from tyranny--the tyranny of Napoleon. On 9 August 1815 the celebrated Madame de Staël (an inveterate opponent of Napoleon) wrote Wellington an ecstatic letter: "My Lord! There is a glory in the world which is unalloyed and without reproach. . . . As you wake up in the morning does your heart not beat with the joy of being you?" (qtd by Longford, *Pillar of State* 24). But Byron holds Wellington responsible, it seems, for the disappointment he feels for Napoleon's failures, and transfers his anger and resentment from his fallen hero to the new-crowned hero of Waterloo--and of Europe. In the end, he seems to say, Napoleon was great, yet he failed; Wellington simply fails to be great: "You did great things, but not being great in mind / Have left undone the greatest--and mankind" (*Don Juan* IX.10.7-8). "It is hard to resist the conclusion," as Webb writes, "that Byron hated Waterloo not least because it terminated the career of an emperor who had behaved like a Romantic hero and established in his place the professional soldier who was noted for his reticence. The laconic Anglo-Saxon virtues could never have appealed to Byron. If Waterloo was a clash of styles, it was unfortunate that the wrong style had won" (60). Byron's passionate response to the glamorous loser also has its parallels to modern celebrity worship and is deeply rooted in the human psyche, as Philip Shaw points out:

> If, as Jacqueline Rose has argued, our interest in celebrity turns on the inevitability of loss, one can understand why Napoleon, solitary, tragic and glamorous, wins out over the "pure good" of Wellington. Too much stultifying rigour is bad for the soul. Crucially, if love of Napoleon the failed adventurer represents a form of perversity, an "impulse [that] is more or less undesirable for the smooth running of our . . . affairs, it is no less the precondition of our participation in the so-called civilized world." In sum, we are predisposed to enjoy the sight of titanic failure because we are drawn to scenes that repeatedly play out our desire to overcome the limits of the possible. (1)

But for most Britons, worn out by years of war and fear, and even for many Romantics, the right style--and the right nation that exemplified that style--had won.

The "laconic Anglo-Saxon virtues" may not have appealed to Byron, but they and their possessor appealed very much to many Britons. "Immortal Wellington!" wrote Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay) to her husband. "*Vive*! *vive*! *vive*!" (qtd by Longford, *Pillar of State* 12). In her journals, Burney records a long description of Wellington at Waterloo communicated to her by a Mr. Saumarez that is characteristic of the ecstatic response to him in the wake of the victory:

> His narration was all triumphant, and his account of the Duke of Wellington might almost have seemed an exaggerated panegyric if it had painted some warrior in a chivalresque romance. He was everywhere, he said; the eye could turn in no direction that it did not perceive him, either at hand or at a distance; galloping to charge the enemy, or darting across the field to issue orders. Every ball also, he said, seemed fired, and every gun aimed at him; yet nothing touched him; he seemed as impervious for safety as he was dauntless for courage: while danger all the time relentlessly robbed him of the services of some one of the bravest of those who were near to him. But he suffered nothing to check or engage him that belonged to personal interest or feeling; his entire concentrated attention, exclusive aim, and intense thought were devoted impartially, imperturbably, and grandly to the Whole, the All. (VI.233)

Wellington's virtues, character, and achievements appealed also to another important Romantic writer, Sir Walter Scott. Scott is also a Romantic, of course, although his Romanticism is rather different from Byron's,[94] and despite his liking for Byron and his real admiration for his poetry, he noted with disapproval in a review of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* Byron's treatment of Wellington's victory over Napoleon:

> That Lord Byron's sentiments do not correspond with ours is obvious, and we are sorry for both our sakes. For our own--because we have lost that note of triumph with which his harp would otherwise have rung over a field of glory such as Britain never reaped before; and on Lord Byron's account,--because it is melancholy to see a man of genius duped by the mere cant of words and phrases, even when facts are most broadly confronted with them. If the poet has mixed with original, wild, and magnificent creations of his imagination, prejudices which he could only have caught by the contagion which he most professes to despise, it is he himself must be the loser. (92)

He regrets also Wellington's pointed absence from Byron's treatment of

---

[94] Although Norbert Lennartz argues in "Re-mapping Romanticism: Lord Byron--Britain's First Anti-Romantic" that Byron was more an anti-Romantic than a Romantic proper, the debate on Romanticism is beyond the boundaries of this dissertation; and for present purposes it seems justified to treat both Byron and Scott as Romantics, however problematic that identification may be.

Waterloo in *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*:

> If his lofty muse has soared in all her brilliancy over the field of Waterloo without dropping even one leaf of laurel on the head of Wellington, his merit can dispense even with the praise of Lord Byron. And as, when the images of Brutus were excluded from the triumphal procession, his memory became only the more powerfully imprinted on the souls of the Romans,–the name of the British hero will be but more eagerly recalled to remembrance by the very lines in which his praise is forgotten. (92)

"The withholding of reference to Wellington, is," Webb notes, "when one considers it, a pointed and striking tactic" (61). Byron hoped that the withholding of praise would become general: "And now what is your fame? Shall the muse tune it ye? / Now that the rabble's first vain shouts are o'er?" (*Don Juan* IX.9,5-6). But his hope was to prove vain. Whatever the scorn heaped on Wellington by Byron and the more radical Whigs, the general acclaim of the Duke was loud, and it extended well beyond the major canonical Romantic poets. "However important," Betty Bennett argues, "the war poems by the major poets constitute a small segment of a vast body of contemporary verse" about war (Introduction 1). After Waterloo, panegyrical poetry devoted to Wellington and the victory poured from the presses.

A typical post-Waterloo panegyric is that written by William Thomas

Fitzgerald,[95] vice-president of the Literary Fund; "The Battle of Waterloo" was printed in six journals and is "representative of pro-battle verses published in the period" (P. Shaw 14). In it Fitzgerald makes the same admission of inadequacy in the face of battle familiar to readers of post-Blenheim panegyric:

> But where's the BARD, however grac'd his name,
> Can venture to describe GREAT WELLESLEY's fame?
> Such Bard, in strength and loftiness of lays,
> May soar beyond hyperbole of praise,
> And yet not give the tribute that is due
> To BRITONS, WELLINGTON, led on by you!! (21-26)

The insistent capitals and strident exclamation marks can make this poem seem, as Philip Shaw says, "the sort of work that yields little or no pressure to the touch of analytic criticism" (14). But there are several significant points to note about it, including the investment of Wellington's heroic gaze and voice with the power to transform action into a narrative of the nation and its power:

> His eagle eye discerns from far
> That moment which decides the war,
> "FORWARD! he cries, "FOR ENGLAND'S GLORY!"
> The veteran bands of GALLIA yield,

---

[95] He is also the addressee of the opening lines of Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*: "Still must I hear?--shall hoarse Fitzgerald bawl / His creaking couplets in a tavern hall, / And I not sing, lest, haply, Scotch reviews / Should dub me scribbler, and denounce my muse?" (*Poems* 113; lines 1-4). Byron's assessment of Fitzgerald's literary talents is accurate.

And WATERLOO'S triumphant field
    Shall shine in BRITISH story! (59-64)

Fitzgerald celebrates Wellington as a culmination of the heroic British past, the climax towards which the narrative of the nation has been moving:

Not CRESSY, AGINCOURT, or BLENHEIM'S day,
Could bear a nobler wreath of fame away;
And PRINCELY EDWARD, HENRY, MARLBOROUGH too,
Had done that justice, WELLINGTON, to you! (65-8)

When Fitzgerald contrasts the figures of triumphant Wellington and defeated Napoleon, he focusses on Wellington as an individual and attributes to him individual heroic action:

How laurell'd WELLINGTON seiz'd Fortune's hour,
To blast like lightning BUONAPARTE'S power,
And with a mighty and tremendous blow,
Confound, defeat, annihilate the Foe! (33-6)

But often he represents Wellington as heroic facilitator of corporate action:

Thus long defensive BRITONS stood,
And brav'd the overwhelming flood,
    With constancy divine!
'Till the brave PRUSSIAN'S distant gun
Induced the GLORIOUS WELLINGTON
    To form the BRITISH LINE. . . . (53-8)

Leigh Hunt, in an editorial in the *Examiner*, tried to shift the public focus from the commander to the people who fought at Waterloo: "It is truly the *English* who have won this great victory, and not one man of merit among them nor one hundred" (qtd by P. Shaw 16). But in the representations of Fitzgerald and others, there is no conflict between the merits of the people and those of their commander, but rather a congruence of worth. For many Britons, including Fitzgerald in this poem, the lure of the heroic leader proved irresistible. Wellington thus functions as the supreme representative of the heroic nation, facilitator of and model for the heroism of others, and he himself becomes the ultimate embodiment of exemplary British heroic manhood.

This close identification of Wellington with the triumphant nation helps to explain why the criticism and satire of some, such as Byron, Shelley, and Hunt, had so little effect on the long-term acclaim accorded the Duke of Wellington. Just as "to oppose the war during these years was to subject oneself to accusations of treason and the violence of 'Church and King' mobs" (Bennett, Introduction 23), attacks on Wellington could be treated as attacks on the nation itself. Bennett notes that "verses in favor of the war linked support of France with destruction of the British establishment" (Introduction 13), and texts in favour of Napoleon and critical of Wellington could be read as destructive of the British nation the latter embodied and exemplified, and could be treated as unacceptably unpatriotic and even treasonous in the reactionary climate of the time.

The long years of war had helped to forge the idea of the nation. The Battle of Waterloo, in particular, contributed greatly to the growing myth of the nation: "Waterloo was perceived therefore, from the outset, as a mythic event occurring outside the texture of documentary or annualized history" (P. Shaw 3), and Wellington's role in it as something equally mythic. Representations of the victory and its hero were central to its nation-building importance, both mythic and quotidian:

> How does a society that has experienced the ecstasy of the Sublime, and thus the fictional foundation of its being, learn to return to the everyday world of experience? Quite simply by supplying representations--romance, tragedy, satire, comedy and epic and so on--that would suggest the possibility of binding Waterloo within the inclusive fabric of narrative historiography. (P. Shaw 13)

Nations need myths. Benedict Anderson famously defines a nation as "an imagined political community" (6). Myth--a form of imagined narrative--can provide a basis for such community. Heroes, as Mark Moss writes, therefore perform an essential function in the myths of nation: "The national hero is thus held as the definitive illustration of the national man, and heroic individuals usually embody the characteristics that a nation holds dear" (53). A national hero like Wellington, therefore, by providing the stuff of myth, serves the cause of nationalism in the lives of individual members of the national community, particularly the male members of that community.

For Sir Walter Scott, Waterloo was "the field where legitimate government had triumphed over the forces of anarchy and despotism" (P. Shaw

36). Like Fitzgerald, though with rather more poetic skill,* Sir Walter Scott links in *The Field of Waterloo* the power of Wellington's gaze and voice and the enactment of heroic British action:

> Then, WELLINGTON! thy piercing eye
> This crisis caught of destiny--
>   The British host had stood
> That morn 'gainst charge of sword and lance
> As their own ocean-rocks hold stance,
> But when thy voice had said, 'Advance!"
>   They were their ocean's flood. (XIII.251-7)

Previously motionless as rocks, the soldiers of the nation are set in motion by the transforming voice of their commander, rather like a force of nature set in motion by the life-giving voice of God; they are transformed from inanimate stones to a moving "ocean's flood" that irresistibly sweeps away the soldiers of Napoleon:

> O thou whose inauspicious aim
> Hath wrought thy host his hour of shame,
> Think'st thou thy broken bands will bide
> The terrors of yon rushing tide?

---

* *The Field of Waterloo* is generally admitted to be one of Scott's lesser works; Philip Shaw notes that "contemporary reviews are ubiquitously damning of the work's structure and versification" (53). Nevertheless, it is unquestionably better than Fitzgerald's clumsy panegyric and those of many others. The poem was written quickly during Scott's brief trip to the continent, when he visited the battlefield, and its profits went to the Waterloo Subscription to support returned soldiers.

Or will thy chosen brook to feel
The British sock of levelled steel? (XIII.258-63)

"The energy of Wellington," comments Shaw, "and by extension British history is shown to be irresistible" (59). Wellington is a force of nature himself, a "beam of light" (X.191) that illuminates the darkness of Napoleonic tyranny. Unlike Wellington's transforming gaze, Napoleon's gaze is wavering, uncertain:

Or dost thou [Napoleon] turn thine eye
Where coming squadrons gleam afar,
And fresher thunders wake the war,
And other standards fly? (XIII.264-7)

His eye cannot set the forces of nature into motion in the service of the nation, as can Wellington's; instead, it can only passively receive the harbingers of his own destruction.

Scott repeatedly underscores Wellington's close identification with the triumphant British nation. Wellington is "his country's sword and shield" (X.188), and the firmness of his men, inspired by his voice and his presence--he stands "Where danger fiercest swept the field" (X.190) whereas Napoleon abandons his men to "The fate their leader shunned to share" (X.186)--mirrors the firmness of the nation: "'Soldiers, stand firm!' exclaimed the chief, / 'England shall tell the fight!'" (X.193-4). His deeds "bankrupt a nation's gratitude" (XIX.399), so it is only fitting that the servant of the nation--amidst all his honours, he thinks with most "pure delight" (XIX.406) that his "honest steel / Was ever drawn for public weal" (XIX.408-9)--should become the embodiment of that nation. It is fitting also, then, that Scott should end the poem proper with a poetic representation of the warrior nation, making it (as does Fitzgerald, and with the same litany of historic military victories) the culmination of a heroic national history:

> Has not such havoc bought a name
> Immortal in the rolls of fame?
> Yes--Agincourt may be forgot,
> And Cressy be an unknown spot,
> And Blenheim's name be new;
> But still in story and in song,
> For many an age remembered long,
> Shall live the towers of Hougoumont
> And Field of Waterloo. (XXIII.490-8)

And in the "Conclusion" to the poem, Great Britain--the heroic nation in peril--takes central stage in the struggle in a way quite unjustified by the actual historical events: "Beside thee Europe's noblest drew the blade, / Each emulous in arms the Ocean Queen to aid" ("Conclusion" lines 26-7). It is worth noting that Scott chooses to use the Spenserian stanza in the conclusion, an unusual verse form for him. In this section highlighting British centrality to the fight against Napoleon, he turns to the same touchstone of poetic nationalism that Prior had turned to more than a century before in celebrating Marlborough in "An Ode, Humbly Inscrib'd to the Queen. On the Glorious Success of Her Majesty's Arms, 1706." Wellington's triumph at Waterloo has thus laid smooth the nation's path to greatness, a path whose origins lay in the mythic heroic past:

Well art thou now repaid--though slowly rose,
And struggled long with mists thy blaze of fame,
While like the dawn that in the orient glows
On the broad wave its earlier lustre came;
Then eastern Egypt saw the growing flame,
And Maida's myrtles gleamed beneath its ray,
Where first the soldier, stung with generous shame,
Rivalled the heroes of the watery way,
And washed in foeman's gore unjust reproach away.
("Conclusion" lines 28-36)

The references to Egypt and Maida are both to campaigns in the Napoleonic Wars, but they function also to evoke an atmosphere of timeless, heroic, mythic warriordom come to glorious fruition in the present of the national triumph performed by Wellington at Waterloo.

By the late seventeenth century, when Marlborough began his rise to his position as military hero, England was clearly no longer a warrior society. But the characteristics associated with heroic leadership, and with exemplary masculinity in general--the willingness and ability to be "aggressive, invasive, exemplary, risk-taking" (Keegan, *The Mask of Command* 10), to be "champions of display, of skill-at-arms, of bold speech but, above all, of exemplary risk-taking" (Keegan, *The Mask of Command* 10-11)--were still rooted in the values and ethos of a warrior society. The challenge was to adapt the values of heroic, warrior-based masculinity to the changed political and social realities of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe. In warrior societies, Keegan notes, leaders typically combine military, political, and religious elements in a cohesive heroic whole (*The Mask of Command* 122). Keegan describes the long, difficult adjustment that took place in the ancient world from the heroic society of the early Greeks to the full-time professional army--"near-relation[s]" of mercenaries"--of the Romans (*The Mask of Command* 125-6). These great shifts "rehearsed and anticipated identical transformations to those that the armies of Western Europe would undergo when they emerged from warriordom at the end of the Middle Ages, passing for the second time through the heroic stage, which resurrected itself after imperial rule by the Romans" (*The Mask of Command* 126). Marlborough and Wellington, both remarkably successful military leaders, came to very different ends partly due to the different points in the process of that transformation in which they lived and worked. Marlborough, despite his military successes and skill at negotiation and diplomacy, fell from the heights of adulation partly because the society of his time had not yet worked out how to separate these previously complementary and now dangerously contradictory strands of heroic leadership. They had been combined by his chief military predecessor in England, Oliver Cromwell, and the results had been disastrous, and disastrously destabilising. Contemporaries feared that Marlborough, too, wished to combine the political and the military, if not the religious, to make of himself a true heroic warrior leader; not surprisingly, they largely preferred the safety of the modernising Hanoverian constitutional monarchy to the dangers of instability and threats of renewed civil war. And so, complicated by recent history and a long tradition of English antimilitarism, his position as military hero proved unsustainable. Operating in a very different political and social climate, in which political and military functions had been more thoroughly separated, Wellington proved markedly more successful at fashioning (or having fashioned for him) a role as heroic leader that was still exemplary and risk-taking but could be represented as a necessary support to monarch, Empire, and nation, not a threat to them, a support that communicated and shared its virtues with the soldiers he led and the nation that he represented without threatening (impossibly) to force a return of the nation to its roots as a warrior society or to plunge it into another civil war. "The dynastic nation state," Keegan writes, "of which he was the perfect servant, represented to him supreme value" (*The Mask of Command* 162), and his role as heroic leader was lived and constructed in service to it. Even when receiving an assignment far inferior to his achievements and position after his return from India, he saw and represented himself as a servant to the nation: "I am *nimmukwallah*, as we say in the East; that is, I have eaten of the King's salt, and, therefore, I conceive it to be my duty to serve with unhesitating zeal and cheerfulness, when and wherever the King or his Government may think proper to employ me" (qtd by Longford, *The Years of the Sword* 161). The tension between the military and political functions that had helped to topple Marlborough from his eminence had largely been resolved, and Wellington was able, despite the criticism of some, such as Byron, Hazlitt, and Shelley, and later criticism of his political policies (such as his opposition to Reform), successfully to transfer his success in the one to success in the other while never threatening to merge them in a way perceived as dangerous to either. In his balance of powers and roles, he could truly be represented as the model of heroic national manhood.

Chapter 6

Everything Old is True Again: or, the Post-Wellingtonian Soldier and the Retrenchment of Heroic Masculinity

"And let the mournful martial music blow;
The last great Englishman is low."

Tennyson, "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington," III.17-18

The staging of Bush's victory lap shortly after the conquest of Baghdad in the spring of 2003--the dramatic landing on the carrier USS Abraham Lincoln, with the president decked out in the full regalia of a naval aviator emerging from the cockpit to bask in the adulation of the crew--was lifted directly from the triumphant final scenes of the movie Top Gun, *with the boyish George Bush standing in for the boyish Tom Cruise. For this nationally televised moment, Bush was not simply mingling with the troops; he had merged his identity with their own and made himself one of them -- the president as warlord. In short order, the marketplace ratified this effort; a toy manufacturer offered for $39.99 a Bush look-alike military action figure advertised as "Elite Force Aviator: George W. Bush--U.S. President and Naval Aviator."*

Andrew J. Bacevich, "The Normalization of War"

To the Victorians, the Duke of Wellington was the epitome of heroic

English manhood: the ideal warrior, the ideal leader, the ideal gentleman, the ideal Englishman. He seemed the embodiment of that heroism praised by Carlyle as the highest possible[97]:

> The Commander over Men; he to whose will our wills are to be subordinated, and loyally so, may be reckoned the most important of Great Men. He is practically the summary for us of *all* the various figures of Heroism; Priest, Teacher, whatsoever of earthly or of spiritual dignity we can fancy to reside in a man, embodies itself here, to *command* over us, to furnish us with constant practical teaching, to tell us for the day and hour what we are to *do*. (Lecture VI; 197)

Wellington provided such "constant practical teaching" in his representation of what it meant to be that ideal man, specifically that ideal Englishman. "The education of character is very much a question of models," asserted Samuel Smiles (347), and the Duke of Wellington was for the Victorians the best of models. Something of the veneration with which they regarded him is evident in the scene in which the young Arthur Pendennis, hero of Thackeray's novel *The History of Pendennis* (1848-50), thrills at even secondhand contact with the great man:

---

[97] Elizabeth Longford writes that "Carlyle had once seen his wife Jane creep up behind the old Duke at a party and without his knowing kiss him very gently on the shoulder" (*Pillar of State* 401). The act seems that of a worshipper at a shrine, and in keeping with the priestly, spiritual aspect of heroism identified by her husband.

> The duke gave the elder Pendennis [Pen's uncle, Major Pendennis] a finger of a pipe-clayed glove to shake, which the major embraced with great veneration; and all Pen's blood tingled, as he found himself in actual communication, as it were, with this famous man (for Pen had possession of the major's left arm, whilst that gentleman's other wing was engaged with his Grace's right), and he wished all Grey Friars' School, all Oxbridge University, all Paternoster Row and the Temple, and Laura and his mother at Fairoaks, could be standing on each side of the street, to see the meeting between him and his uncle, and the most famous duke in Christendom. (Chp. XXXVI; 461-2)

Just as in France "Napoleon's myth reveals much more about the nineteenth century than about the identity of Bonaparte himself" (qtd by Hazareesingh 4), so the British veneration of Napoleon in the nineteenth century reveals more about Victorian Britain than it does about the person of the Duke. "Of all the nineteenth century's modern heroes," writes Iain Pears, "the Duke of Wellington was by far the most eminent," and "the qualities he came to symbolize became built into the national consciousness as part of the essential fabric of Englishness," thereby encapsulating "a newly-forming vision of national type which, through his personal success and the way he could be opposed to the personification of foreign threat, provided a form of shorthand by which this notion could be disseminated" (217-8). In other words, as already argued, Wellington was represented as the exemplar of heroic national manhood, the hero whose "personal masculinity [was] the guarantee of his country's prowess" (Braudy 159). Englishmen could model themselves on him, measure themselves against him, reassure themselves of both their Englishness and their manliness by assenting to and participating in panegyrical representations and celebrations of him. Wellington became an embodiment of national myth. Myth, as Harry Garlick writes, "is a process of abstracting from experience the symbolization of a desire" (9), and myths of nation abstract from experience the symbolisation of national desire, in this case the desire for a clearly defined heroic national manhood that could stand against the national myths of others--especially the French--at the same time as it could perpetuate itself by inspiring the men of later times to emulate him. Such emulation would ensure the reinforcement of both the myth itself and the enactment of that myth in the lives of individual men. More than any other figure in nineteenth-century Britain, Wellington became the embodiment of that desire of which Garlick speaks, and was therefore enshrined in myth, a myth that rose above the actual political turmoil and difference of opinion that surrounded him in the heyday of his political and military ascendancy. "In all that has singled out England from the nations, and given her the front place in the history of the world," the *Gentleman's Magazine* wrote in October 1852, just after his death, "the Duke of Wellington was emphatically an Englishman" (qtd by Pears 218).[38] The Duke *was* England, and therefore all England could lay claim to his virtues by virtue of their common membership in the nation, as is made clear in the *Times* on 18 September 1852, just four days after his death:

> It may truly be said that not only kings and princes, but all ranks, all classes, every age and sex in this country, have delighted to honour the man through whom, as all believed, Heaven had given it deliverance. . . . It has always struck us most forcibly that the perfect ideal of the Englishman was to be found in the duke of WELLINGTON. All such personal admiration, philosophers tell us, is only a subtle form of self-worship, and certainly we should never all agree to a man who was not singularly like ourselves. That deep community of feeling we believe to be at the bottom of the unbounded homage we have paid this name. (qtd by Garlick 106)

Admiration of this model of national manliness brings all together, is both product and perpetuation of national unity. And ultimately, as the *Times* asserts, worship of the hero is worship of the self, or at least of those qualities the worshippers most wish to see in themselves. "In his death," Harry Garlick argues, "Wellington aroused in the populace a renewed awareness of what those qualities were that were valued as uniquely English" (112).

---

[38] This assertion ignores the fact that the Duke was "emphatically" born and spent most of his early life in Ireland. But when facts and myth collide, myth usually wins out. As Murray G.H. Pittock notes, "For myths are facts to those who objectify them in belief, and become part of that nature of things declared by Burke to be a sturdy adversary" (*Poetry and Jacobite Politics* 3). Of course, the Duke himself denied that his Irish roots made him Irish: "You might as well call a man a horse because he was born in a stable," he said (qtd. in Lucas 189).

It was his grand state funeral on 18 November 1852, more than two months after his death on 14 September, that most fully displayed the mythic power of Wellington's representation as exemplar of heroic national manhood. As in life, the Duke was held up in death as an exemplar of Englishness, an embodiment of the virtues of the nation in contrast to the qualities of its enemies, especially the French. It is worth noting that the funeral was intended in part as an answer to the state funeral of Napoleon in Paris in 1840 (Pears 221).[39] Nearly a million people had lined the streets of Paris to watch the funeral procession of the former Emperor (A. Roberts 275). The organisers of the Duke of Wellington's obsequies were determined to make them a demonstration of English superiority: "The funeral was to emphasize substance rather than style, and provide a material contrast between English solidity and the French preference for flashy but empty display" (Pears 220). And the people responded fervently to this display. Wellington's body lay in state before the funeral, and the crowds to view his coffin were tremendous: 10,800 people crowded in on the first day on which the public was admitted, and thousands more were turned away after waiting for hours in the rain. On subsequent days, the crowd was such that five people died and many more were injured in the crush. "By the time the doors finally closed," Neville Thompson writes, "about 235,000 people had paid their respects" (261). The funeral itself has been called "the greatest spectacle that the Victorian world had seen" (Garlick 112). The funeral car, partly designed by Prince Albert, and still to be seen in the crypt of St. Paul's cathedral, was covered with symbols of Wellington's military victories, and the whole structure weighed eighteen tons. Despite being pulled by twelve huge dray horses (borrowed from a London brewery), it sank into the mud in Pall Mall and could only be moved when sixty strong men had been roped in to pull it out. Longford calls the funeral car "an earthly mansion on wheels which would somehow carry the thoughts of millions to mansions above" (*Pillar of State* 403). A million and a half people lined the route of the immense funeral cortège, and a further 20,000 waited inside the Cathedral. The massiveness of the spectacle and the sheer numbers of people who participated ensured that the entire event was truly a performance of "national solidarity and unity" (Pears 219).

---

[39] Napoleon had died, of course, in 1821, but his body was exhumed from its grave on St. Helena (with British permission) and transported to Paris for reburial.

Among the writers to respond to the funeral was Tennyson. His "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington" was his "first separate publication since becoming Poet Laureate," although it was not an official Laureate poem (Ricks 488-9). Except for the title, Wellington's name is not mentioned in the poem, partly, perhaps, because it is not a name that easily lends itself to rhyme, but mostly to emphasise the fact that his importance is not individual but national and mythic. Instead of being Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington, he is "the

Great Duke" (I.1, 3), "the great World-victor" (IV.42), "the Man" (VII.178), and "our English Duke" (VII.189). This last epithet further reinforces his identity with the nation by being contrasted with another historical figure: "Truth-teller was our England's Alfred named; / Truth-teller was our English Duke" (VII.188-9). Tennyson repeatedly underscores the Duke's significance as national monument and embodiment of the nation. The Duke is "England's greatest son" (VI.95), and "a reverent people behold / The towering car, the sable steeds" (V.54-5) that bear his body to its final resting place. His funeral procession is accompanied by "a nation weeping"(VI.82), he is buried "To the noise of the mourning of a mighty nation" (I.4), and his greatness and the nation's are mutually reinforcing; each makes possible, reinforces, and enacts the greatness of the other. He is "The statesman-warrior, moderate, resolute, / Whole in himself, a common good" (IV.25-6). His virtues are those of the nation, which also wishes to see itself as "moderate, resolute," whole in itself, its greatness contributing to, even making possible, the greater common good. Nowhere, as John Lucas notes, does Tennyson acknowledge "the complexity and divisiveness of the experience of being English"; instead, "the ode operates so as to dismiss oppositional voices by identifying 'the people' with monarchy, with Wellingtonian statesmanship and with God's will" (189). And because the common good that Wellington embodied and performed reaches beyond the borders of England to benefit all, it is only appropriate that his death should be the occasion of "an universal woe" (III.14), not merely a national one. Because the woe is universal, his body is "followed by the brave of other lands" (VIII.194), who pay tribute not only to his greatness but to that of the nation. The nation he exemplified may have most reason to mourn his loss, but all should mourn the loss of what he represented because all benefited from it, and will continue to benefit from it if only others are moved to follow his example and carry on his legacy of national greatness:

> But while the races of mankind endure,
> Let his great example stand
> Colossal, seen of every land,
> And keep the soldier firm, the statesman pure:
> Till in all lands and through all human story
> The path of duty be the way to glory. (VIII.219-24)

And his example is not diminished by his death, as Samuel Smiles's *Self Help* (1859) asserts:

> The chief use of biography consists in the noble models of character in which it abounds. Our great forefathers still live among us in the records of their lives, as well as in the acts they have done, which live also; still sit by us at table, and hold us by the hand; furnishing examples for our benefit, which we may still study, admire and imitate. Indeed, whoever has left behind him the record of a noble life, has bequeathed to posterity an enduring source of good, for it serves as a model for others to form themselves by in all time to come; still breathing fresh life into men, helping them to reproduce his life anew, and to

> illustrate his character in other forms. Hence a book containing the life of a true man is full of precious seed. (350-1)

And the example of the Duke was available in far more than books of biography: it was in statues and monuments, in prints and portraits, "on walls, snuff-boxes, tea services, fans, bells, door-stops, brooches, note-books, clocks, watches, barometers, and razors" (Wellesley and Steegmann ix).[100] And it was available to the nation in the grand spectacle of his state funeral.

The emphasis on duty in Tennyson's lines is, of course, characteristically Victorian. The Duke had himself, as already noted, emphasised duty as his chief motivation, and connected that duty both to the nation and to the nation's imperialising mission: "I am *nimmukwallah,* as we say in the East; that is, I have eaten of the King's salt, and, therefore, I conceive it to be my duty to serve with unhesitating zeal and cheerfulness, when and wherever the King or his Government may think proper to employ me" (qtd by Longford. *The Years of the Sword* 161). And the nation followed his lead, or wished to believe that it did. The "Ode" asserts that the man again exemplifies the best of the nation and inspires the nation to be its best. Duty, for the Victorians, was a moral imperative, "the primary ethic of this life" (Newsome 194). Smiles contrasts the dutiful

---

[100] Similar artifacts celebrating Napoleon were produced in large quantities in France in the nineteenth century, as well: "There were poems, books, plays, and pieces of music written in Napoleon's honour; his achievements were immortalized in street names and inscriptions, and on paintings, busts, and public monuments; and his image was affixed to countless objects, ranging from knives and tobacco boxes to scarves and ties" (Hazareesingh 2).

Englishman with the flashy Frenchman, his opponent: "Napoleon's aim was 'Glory'; Wellington's watch-word, like Nelson's, was 'Duty'" (233). This aspect of the Duke's character receives ample praise in Tennyson's "Ode":

> Yea, let all good things await
> Him who cares not to be great,
> But as he saves or serves the state.
> Not once or twice in our rough island-story,
> The path of duty was the way to glory:
> He that walks it, only thirsting
> For the right, and learns to deaden
> Love of self, before his journey closes,
> He shall find the stubborn thistle bursting
> Into glossy purples, which outredden
> All voluptuous garden-roses.
> Not once or twice in our fair island-story,
> The path of duty was the way to glory:
> He, that ever following her commands,
> On with toil of heart and knees and hands,
> Through the long gorge to the far light has won
> His path upward, and prevailed,
> Shall find the toppling crags of Duty scaled
> Are close upon the shining table-lands
> To which our God Himself is moon and sun.

Such was he: his work is done. (VIII.198-218)

His work may be done, but that of the living has only begun. In the absence of his living example, his myth must inspire and move others to emulate him. Then the ongoing "island-story" of which he was such a glorious embodiment, the poet asserts, will continue its progress, onward and upward, to reach the "shining table-lands" where God Himself wishes them to be. In Iain Pears' words, Wellington is portrayed "not merely as a successful general, but rather as the culmination of two millennia of strife, and as the man who finally produced the peace of nations under the benevolence of English supremacy" (220). All of English history has been moving towards this man and his achievement.

The note of divine approbation is struck early in the poem:

Render thanks to the Giver,
England, for thy son.
Let the bell be tolled.
Render thanks to the Giver,
And render him to the mould. (V.46-8)

The calls to remember the Great Duke's name begin quietly, but rise to a height of religious fervour that is quite startling. Tennyson ends the fifth section of the "Ode" with his first appeal to the preservation of his name:

O civic muse, to such a name,
To such a name for ages long,
To such a name,
Preserve a broad approach of fame,

And ever-echoing avenues of song. (V.75-9)

These lines, especially the two last, evoke the language of the Book of Revelations with its descriptions of angels singing eternally before the throne in the City of God. The lines immediately following, which open the sixth section of the poem, continue and extend the Biblical tone: "Who is he that cometh, like an honoured guest, / With banner and with music, with soldier and with priest . . . ?" (VI.80-81). The language is redolent with Biblical allusion, suggesting Christ's entry into Jerusalem and David dancing before the Ark, as well as the words of the foolish virgins who are caught unaware by the coming of the bridegroom: "Behold, the bridegroom cometh: go ye out to meet him" (Matthew 25:6). The lines also suggest the Song of Solomon: "Who *is* this that cometh out of the wilderness like pillars of smoke, perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, with all powders of the merchant?" (3:6), and "Who *is* this that cometh up from the wilderness, leaning upon her beloved?" (8:5). Perhaps there is also a suggestion of lines from Psalm 24: "Who *is* this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle" (Psalm 24: 8). Wellington is later called the "saviour of the silver-coasted isle" and "shaker of the Baltic and the Nile" (IV.136-7), one who moved the world with almost divine power. The Duke of Wellington, then, is represented as the emissary of God, whom the people follow, whose actions have divine sanction, and whose example is divinely blessed.

The invocations of Wellington's name continue to build in intensity in subsequent sections. The sixth section ends thus:

> And through the centuries let a people's voice
> In full acclaim,
> A people's voice,
> The proof and echo of all human fame,
> A people's voice, when they rejoice
> At civic revel and pomp and game,
> Attest their great commander's claim
> With honour, honour, honour, honour to him,
> Eternal honour to his name. (VI.142-50)

As before, the repetitions of word and phrase and the irregular rhythms and line lengths echo Biblical and liturgical cadences. The invocation to his name that ends the eighth section of the "Ode" repeats many of the same words and phrases:

> And let the land whose hearths he saved from shame
> For many and many an age proclaim
> At civic revel and pomp and game,
> And when the long-illumined cities flame,
> Their ever-loyal iron leader's fame,
> With honour, honour, honour, honour to him,
> Eternal honour to his name. (VIII.225-31)

The assertion of divine sanction for both man and nation is most explicitly stated in the closing section of the "Ode." "On God and Godlike men we build our trust," the poet says (IX.266), and the "we" of whom he speaks has been established throughout the poem as the nation, implicitly the male--and therefore leading--part of that nation, who are most able to follow Wellington's manly example and use it to spread the essential goodness of what he embodied throughout the world. For what woman could or would wish to emulate his manly virtues? Femininity is entirely absent in the poem. The nation, like its embodiment, is male, and its virtues preeminently the masculine virtues. Throughout the "Ode," Tennyson seems to accept unquestioningly the relationship between heroic masculinity, the nation, and the man--the Duke of Wellington--who embodied and exemplified both.

Many scholars and historians have noted the increasing militarism of Victorian Britain and its colonialised outposts and the consequent emphasis on the learning and performance of proper manliness.[101] What Keegan calls "a simple bourgeois pleasure in the wearing of uniforms and the bandying-about of military titles" (*The Face of Battle* 223) was given an irresistible connection with glory and the allurements of martial masculinity by such factors as the heroic myths of the nation, the public worship of Great Men (Wellington preeminent among them, of course), and growing imperial might. Militarism was further encouraged by the ever-present reality of war in these years: "In every year of Victoria's reign British soldiers were fighting somewhere in the world" (Peck ix). Most of this fighting took place in the colonies, and it is essential to recognise the interrelationship between rising militarism and the lure of Empire. The success of the military in winning "campaigns small in scope but spectacular in results" (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 357) fed nineteenth-century militarism and the veneration in which military heroes were held. The British nation was, as John Peck notes, "an aggressive, expansionist, imperialist, military power" (xiv), and much cultural work was done both to foster the values necessary to continue in that role and to glorify the actions of the nation in the world. The myth of heroic masculinity as a bulwark of the nation "allowed men living in a world of imperialist expansion to believe that they were engaged more in a spiritual quest than in a materialistic conquest" (Braudy 289). Organised military bands, for example, as Robert Giddings argues, really began during the Napoleonic period, and they and the music composed for them are almost entirely products of the nineteenth century, whatever spurious traditions have been invented for them.[102] Popular poetry was infused with "military heroism and the martial spirit" (Richards 81); Jeffrey Richards cites as examples Rudyard Kipling, Arthur Conan Doyle, Sir Henry Newbolt, and Sir Francis Doyle, as well as W.E. Henley's immensely successful and oft-reprinted 1891 anthology *Lyra Heroica* (81-2). The binding themes of this anthology (and there were many similar ones in the years before 1914) were service, sacrifice, comradeship, heroism, and death in battle (Richards 82): in other words, the virtues of martial masculinity.

---

[101] For recent examples of such work, see the collection of essays edited by John M. MacKenzie, *Popular Imperialism and the Military, 1850-1950* (1992), Graham Dawson's *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (1994), Jonathan Rutherford's *Forever England: Reflections on Masculinity and Empire* (1997), and Mark Moss's *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War* (2001).

---

[102] Victorian militarism affected other genres of music, as well, including hymns. "Onward! Christian Soldiers," based on an 1864 poem by Sabine Baring-Gould, was set to music by Arthur Sullivan in 1871 (Braudy 288).

The technological transformation of warfare posed a powerful challenge to the ancient association between the warrior and the performance of ideal masculinity. The revolution had begun with the increasing use of gunpowder in the sixteenth century, which had helped to provoke exactly that tension in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries examined in earlier chapters. This tension seemed resolved in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars, as the nation celebrated military heroism and the ideal masculinity it engendered throughout the nineteenth century. But technological innovation would disturb that equilibrium. Vastly increased firepower, advances in transportation and communications, the increased size of armies,[103] and the expansion of fronts and battlefields to enormous size put tremendous pressure on the construction of ideal heroic masculinity. "Increasingly," as Leo Braudy among others has noted, "throughout the nineteenth century, the demands of ideal honour," and therefore of ideal masculinity, "and the demands of actual war were fatally in conflict" (284). That conflict became tragically clear in the muddy trenches of the Western Front in World War One.

World War One brought about a sense of radical discontinuity in those who lived through it, as Samuel Hynes writes:

> The First World War was the great military and political event of its time; but it was also the great *imaginative* event. It altered the ways in which men and women thought not

---

[103] Keegan notes that European and American armies grew during this time "to consume the whole manhood of nations" (*The Mask of Command* 221).

> only about war but about the world, and about culture and its expressions. No one after the war--no thinker or planner, no politician or labour leader, no writer or painter--could ignore its historical importance or frame his thought as though the war had not occurred, or had been simply another war. (*A War Imagined* ix)

For it was not "simply another war"; it was a war unlike any people had experienced before, and it blew apart long-cherished assumptions about the nature of war and the nature of heroic masculinity. For it was exactly those assumptions, many thought, assumptions rooted in the militarism so cherished by the Victorians, that brought about the disaster in the first place.[104] The widespread and heavily reinforced belief was that battle both created manly men and provided the ultimate proving ground for manhood. As one recruiting poster widely posted in the Lake District pointedly asked, "Are you a man, or are you a mouse?" As David Cannadine notes, "Only one answer was possible"

---

[104] Samuel Hynes points out that the American experience of the war was very different from the European: "Because it was brief, American soldiers don't seem to have lost their recruiting-office feeling that this war would be an American adventure, to be entered into for the goodwill of the thing, because Europe needed help. It didn't generate disillusionment among the American troops, or any change of national feelings about leaders and values; it was moral at the beginning and moral at the end" (*A Soldier's Tale* 96). America had to wait for the experience of Vietnam to question seriously the essential rightness and manliness of war. For recent scholarship about the Vietnam War, literature, and manliness see the collections of articles edited by Michael Bibby entitled *The Vietnam War and Postmodernity* (1999) and by Paul Budra and Michael Zeitlin entitled *Soldier Talk: The Vietnam War in Oral Narrative* (2004), Veit Buntz's "'Hammered Out of Artillery Shells': The Discourse of Trauma in Vietnam Veterans' Poetry" (2003), and Bibby's *Hearts and Minds: Bodies, Poetry, and Resistance in the Vietnam Era* (1996).

(73). That belief was betrayed by the experience of modern war:

> The populations that had embraced the outbreak of 1914 with such enthusiasm had despatched their young men to the battlefronts in the belief that they would win not only victories but glory, and that their return with laurels would justify all the trust they had invested in the culture of universal service and commitment to warriordom. The war exploded that illusion. (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 364)

That initial enthusiasm brought young men to enlist in the early days of the war in enormous numbers. By the end of August 1914, the number of men in uniform in Europe had already reached twenty million (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 22). In Great Britain, the patrician class was particularly ready to serve: "In August 1914, the patricians had eagerly anticipated a gentlemen's war. . . . They had rallied to the defence of their country and empire. But although they had fought like knights of old, they had been slaughtered like animals, and had fallen like flies" (Cannadine 84). Indeed, they had died in great numbers:

> Not since the Wars of the Roses had so many patricians died so suddenly and so violently. And their losses were, proportionately, far greater than those of any other social group. . . . Of the British and Irish peers and their sons who served during the war, one in five was killed. But the comparable figure for all members of the fighting services

> was one in eight. (Cannadine 83)

As Paul Fussell writes, we cannot but be moved, knowing what we do of their fate, by "the innocents of the . . . Great War, those sweet, generous people who pressed forward and all but solicited their own destruction" (19).

The high-minded idealism with which many of them arrived at the recruiting offices also informs the war sonnets of Rupert Brooke, for a long time the poet seen as most representative of the writers of the First World War. Brooke died in 1915 while en route for Gallipoli[105] and saw little action before his death. William E. Laskowski notes that "it is almost impossible to disentangle an analysis of Brooke's war poems from the history of their reception, which in many senses mirrors the history of the transformation of attitudes toward the World War I" (58). Donald Davie has called Brooke "the English soldier of 1914" and Owen "the English soldier of 1918." Had Brooke lived, his later work might well have become as bitterly disillusioned as Owen's; Owen's early verse certainly bears little resemblance to the antiwar verse for which he is remembered. But the war sonnets by Brooke are anything but bitter. Instead, they promote a positive ideology of warfare, seeing in it an antidote to the laxness and luxury of the prosperous prewar years, an opportunity to prove and perform manhood:

> Now, God be thanked Who has matched us with His hour,
>
> And caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping,

---

[105] He died of blood poisoning and was buried on an island in the Mediterranean.

With hand made sure, clear eye, and sharpened power,
To turn, as swimmers into cleanness leaping,
Glad from a world grown old and cold and weary,
Leave the sick hearts that honour could not move,
And half-men, and their dirty songs and dreary,
And all the little emptiness of love! (Sonnet I. Peace; lines 1-8)

War will, this first of the war sonnets asserts, rescue its participants from the risk of being but "half-men" and from the dangerous, effeminising "little emptiness of love." Instead, these sonnets proclaim, it will be cleansing and purifying, will give warriors access to masculine "power." That power is rooted in action, for manhood is about action, and is negated by passivity. Prose accounts, such as those by Robert Graves, Siegfried Sassoon, and Vera Brittain, may not represent the prewar years as idyllic,[106] but they are intensely aware of the horror and the loss, both personal and national, brought about by the war as Brooke in his sonnets is not. Of course, written as early in the war as these sonnets were, it is impossible that they should display a sense of the loss and intense disillusionment brought about by as many years of warfare as Brittain, Sassoon, and Graves lived through. Earlier in the war, idealism still survived undiminished. An early war poem of Sassoon's, "Absolution" (dated April-

---

[106] Paul Fussell writes of the glow of the prewar years, bathed in the light of nostalgic recreation of what was destroyed in the trenches: "Although some memories of the benign last summer before the war can be discounted as standard romantic retrospection turned even rosier by egregious contrast with what followed, all agree that the prewar summer was the most idyllic for many years" (14).

September 1915) expresses very similar sentiments to those of Brooke's "Peace":

The anguish of the earth absolves our eyes
Till beauty shines in all that we can see.
War is our scourge; yet war has made us wise,
And, fighting for our freedom, we are free.

Horror of wounds and anger at the foe,
And loss of things desired; all these must pass.
We are the happy legion, for we know
Time's but a golden wind that shakes the grass.

There was an hour when we were loth to part
From life we longed to share no less than others.
Now, having claimed this heritage of heart,
What need we more, my comrades and my brothers?

Sassoon comments wryly in a note to this poem that "people used to feel like this when they 'joined up' in 1914 and 1915. No one feels it when they 'go out again'" (Sassoon 15). Although this poem participates in the sentimental idealisation of war, it lacks that fervent belief in the masculinising effects of war that informs Brooke's sonnets.

In recent decades, the reputations of such war poets as Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon have outstripped that of Brooke. This change has more to do with changing attitudes to war since the 1960s than with any sense of the poets' relative worth as writers. In the wake of many more bitter wars since Brooke's death--including the Second World War, Korea, Vietnam, and Iraq--Brooke's romantic positive ideology of war and martial masculinity seems to many less sympathetic than Sassoon's and Owen's bitter denunciations of such romanticism. Owen's most famous antiwar poem, "Dulce et Decorum Est," provides a marked contrast with Brooke's sonnets. Whereas Brooke fills his sonnets with abstractions, Owen is concerned with the concrete, quotidian details of modern war, of bodies wounded, bleeding, and weakened by the sudden, unexpected descent of gas, a weapon against which no manly action can be taken. The inadequacy of the abstractions of martial heroism in the face of such experience is exactly the point of the poem. If you could see such things, the speaker says, "you would not tell with such high zest / To children ardent for some desperate glory, / The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est / Pro patria mori" (lines 25-8). Compare the sestet of the third of Brooke's war sonnets, entitled "The Dead":

> Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our dearth,
>   Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
> Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
>   And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
> And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
>   And we have come into our heritage. (lines 9-14)

These lines are dominated by a sonorous succession of capitalised abstractions, some of them the same abstractions Owen explicitly disavows in the preface to his volume of poetry (published posthumously): "This book is not about heroes. . . . Nor is it about deeds, or lands, nor anything about glory, honour, might, majesty, dominion, or power, except War" (Owen 31). Owen thus explicitly rejects the ideology of heroic masculinity and its ultimate expression--war.

Brooke and Owen may be representative of the soldiers of 1914 and 1918 respectively, as Davie suggests, but the attitudes expressed by Brooke did not disappear during the course of the war. A significant amount of verse that was not antiwar continued to appear. As Jeffrey C. Williams writes, war poetry closer to Brooke's than to Owen's and Sassoon's continued to be written and widely read, a recognition of which forces "a revisionist critique of our common held memory of British participation in the Great War" (47).[107] The romantic view of purifying, manly warfare espoused by Brooke never really goes away but continues to make itself felt even in the work of those who were as bitter about the war as Owen. An interesting example of this may be found in Richard Aldington's war novel (a bestseller when it was first published in 1929), *The Death of a Hero*. Its hero, George Winterbourne, is never fooled by the prevailing rhetoric into support for the war, even in its early days. He regards himself as free from all "cant" (a favourite word): "It was the régime of Cant *before* the War which made the Cant *during* the War so damnably possible and easy" (222). He freely condemns the army, the empire, and all things military, as well as the political leadership that brought Britain into this horrifying war that has caused so much waste and destruction. He bitterly rejects the abstractions that Brooke clings to in "The Dead":

---

[107] Paul Norgate discusses the "Soldier Poets" of two immensely popular anthologies edited by Galloway Kyle (editor of the *Poetry Review* from early 1916): *Songs of the Fighting Men* (1916) and *More Songs by the Fighting Men* (1917). "With perhaps an occasional gesture at the undesirability of War in the abstract," Norgate writes, both anthologies "everywhere endorse an unquestioning acceptance of the necessity for continued prosecution of *this* war and of all the sacrifices entailed--including the grim conditions of the Western Front" (517). The generally positive response to these volumes, in terms of both sales and reviews, "suggests that this sort of verse was not merely approved of but actively sought, desired. In a time of bitter uncertainties the voice of the Soldier Poets, speaking from the front itself, sanctioned the continuation of the war" (Norgate 518-9).

> Then you have the Rudyard Kipling or British Public School solution, not so far removed from the other as you might think, for it is a harnessing of the same primitive instincts to the service of a group--the nation--instead of to the service of the individual. Whatever is done for the Empire is right. Not Truth and Justice, but British Truth and British Justice. Odious profanation! you are the servant of the Empire; never mind whether you are rich or poor, do what the Empire tells you, and so long as the Empire is rich and powerful you ought to be happy. (167-8)

Such abstractions both narrator and hero regard as examples of the cant responsible for all that is wrong with the world, of which the war is the ultimate result. "The long, unendurable nightmare had begun," the narrator says when war is declared. "And the reign of Cant, Delusion, and Delirium" (221). Thus he offers his own capitalised nouns as substitutes for those whose power he rejects. And he explicitly connects the militaristic cant offered as justification for war with the Victorian ideology of heroism I have already discussed: "It was the supreme and tragic climax of Victorian Cant, for after all the Victorians were still in full blast in 1914, and had pretty much the control of everything" (223).

George, like the narrator, hates the war from the beginning, and he explicitly disavows the notion that violence in battle is the opportunity for the display of a superior sort of masculinity, comparing it instead in a long internal monologue to the aberrant masculinity of criminality:

> Look at Chicago! We're always patting ourselves on the back and looking smugly at wicked Chicago. When there's a shoot-up between gangs, do you approve of it, do you give the winning side medals for their gallantry, do you tell 'em to go to it and you'll kiss them when they come back, do you march 'em by with a brass band and tell 'em what fine fellows they are? Do you take the gunman as the high ideal of humanity? I know all about military grandeur and devotion to duty--I'm a soljer meself, marm. (245)

Given all this, George's reaction to a group of men returning from leave is astonishing. The scene takes place as George is on the quay preparing to embark for the continent for his first experience of battle; there he sees a group of men, battle-hardened veterans, returning to the field from leave. At his first sight of them, George is moved to a rhapsodic response:

> For the first time since the declaration of War, Winterbourne felt almost happy. These men were men. There was something intensely masculine about them,

> something very pure and immensely friendly and stimulating. They had been where no woman and no half-men had ever been, could endure to be. There was something timeless and remote about them, as if (so Winterbourne thought) they had been Roman legionaries or the men of Austerlitz or even the invaders of the Empire. They looked barbaric but not cruel. Under their grotesque wrappings, their bodies looked lean and hard and tireless. They were Men. (253)

This is startlingly similar to the position taken by Brooke's sonnet "Peace," in which war is seen as a purifying experience that purges "half-men" and all traces of the feminine:

> "By god!" he said to himself, "you're men, not boudoir rabbits and lounge lizards. I don't care a damn what your cause is--it's almost certainly a foully rotten one. But I do know you're the first real men I've looked upon. I swear you're better than the women and the half-men, and by god! I swear I'll die with you rather than live in a world without you." (Aldington 253-4)

Whereas the new, yet untried soldiers awaiting embarkation, including George himself, are dressed in proper uniforms, still unsoiled by battle and trench living, the leave men are casually dressed, their uniforms stained and damaged; yet they have the air of true soldiers that the new recruits in their clean, precisely arranged uniforms cannot yet display. They are men, and George is thrilled to think that he will soon be one of them: "With a start Winterbourne realized that in two or three months, if he were not hit, he would be one of them, indistinguishable from them, whereas now, in the ridiculous jackanapes get-up of the peace-time soldier, he felt humiliated and ashamed beside them" (253). This rhapsody on martial masculinity is the more surprising since it is surrounded by continued antiwar sentiment. George, the unnamed narrator (a war buddy of George's), and presumably Aldington himself see no disjunction between this rhapsodic response to martially derived heroic masculinity and belief in the cleansing, purifying power of war as espoused by Brooke--otherwise a very different writer with very different aims--and their antiwar sentiments and rhetoric. The passage is a remarkable example of the continued power of a cultural myth of masculinity despite conscious opposition to its consequences. One way to understand this seeming contradiction is provided by James Campbell's notion of "'combat gnosticism,' the belief that combat represents a qualitatively separate order of experience that is difficult if not impossible to communicate to any who have not undergone an identical experience" (203). Further, Campbell explicitly links the notion to gender, calling it

> a construction that gives us war experience as a kind of gnosis, a secret knowledge which only an initiated elite knows. Only men (there is, of course, a tacit gender exclusion operating here) who have actively engaged in

> combat have access to certain experiences that are productive of, perhaps even constitutive of, an arcane knowledge. Furthermore, mere military status does not signify initiation, but only status as a combatant. It is not the label of "soldier" that is privileged so much as the label of "warrior." (204)

The assumption therefore is that those who have lived through combat, "a liminal experience that sets the veteran irrevocably apart from those who have not crossed the ritual threshold of war" (Campbell 204), have a special "connection to Reality, an unmediated Truth" (Campbell 207) utterly unavailable to noncombatants. It is this assumption of "combat gnosticism" that allows Aldington's hero simultaneously to attack the war and to celebrate the notions of martial masculinity that underlie it.[108]

The linkage between the warrior and ideal masculinity may become strained, as it did in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and again in the early twentieth century after the First World War, but it still exerts its power over the imaginations of men. David Rosen argues in *The Changing Fictions of Masculinity* that new constructions of manhood never completely displace the earlier constructions to which they may be opposed. The result is increasing multiplicity not replacement of one ideology with another. This means that earlier constructions of masculinity continue to operate alongside of newer ones, contesting with them for cultural supremacy. In addition, new constructions are not simply invented out of whole cloth; instead, they necessarily incorporate elements of older constructions into their fabric, where they continue to exercise power and to shape both the theory and the practice of masculinity. Indeed, as noted earlier, their partially submerged nature may give them increased, because unsuspected, power, or, in Hegelian terms, what is familiar (*bekannt*) is often not really known (*erkannt*) precisely because it seems so familiar (qtd. in Brod 2-3).

---

[108] Campbell argues that the assumption of "combat gnosticism" grounds mainstream war poetry criticism, thereby severely limiting "the canon of texts . . . seen as legitimate war writing" and simultaneously promoting "war literature's status as a discrete body of work with almost no relation to non-war writing" (203). Such criticism therefore "does not so much criticize the poetry which forms its subject as replicate the poetry's ideology" (203).

Modern warfare is a remarkably different thing from the warfare that shaped our world and created, among other things, our conception of what it means to be a man. Above all, modern war--the mechanisation of battle, in particular--has drastically increased "the strain thrown on the human participants" in battle (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 299). It has also necessarily changed the representation of war and its leaders, as Samuel Hynes suggests: "Technology is the enemy of romance, in war as in other things" (*The Soldier's Tale* 41). Examples of the impossibility of heroism as traditionally understood under the conditions of modern mechanised warfare abound, as in Sassoon's "Trench Duty":

> There's the big bombardment on our right
> Rumbling and bumping; and the dark's a glare
> Of flickering horror in the sectors where

> We raid the Bosche; men waiting, stiff and chilled,
> Or crawling on their bellies through the wire.
> "What? Stretcher-bearers wanted? Some one killed?"
> Five minutes ago I heard a sniper fire:
> Why did he do it? . . . Starlight overhead--
> Blank stars. I'm wide-awake; and some chap's dead. (lines 6-14)

The enemy here is faceless and anonymous, the reasons for the enemy's actions inexplicable and without context, and death removed and distant. The technical language of warfare--bombardment, sector, wire, sniper--overwhelms the feeble light of the stars.

The elements of modern warfare that came as such a shock to those raised on the ideology of martial masculinity have continued to strengthen. Battles have gotten longer,[109] the killing power of weapons has increased, the battlefield has been transformed into an environment "almost wholly--and indiscriminately--hostile to man" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 308), the skills necessary for military work have become more technical and specialised, "the divergence between the facts of everyday life and of battlefield existence is . . . greater than ever before" and "widening year by year" (Keegan, *The Face of*

---

[109] John Keegan compares Agincourt (1415)--hours--to Waterloo (16-18 June 1815)--three days, although the main battle took place in about 9 hours on one day--to the Somme (1 July-18 November 1916)--four and a half months,Verdun (21 February-20 December 1916)--ten months, and Stalingrad (23 August 1942-31 January 1943)--five months (*Face* 303). A battle that continues for months at a time is a very different thing from a battle governed and shaped by the hours of daylight; it becomes more of a prolonged and very deadly siege than a battle.

Battle 320), and warfare has become increasingly impersonalised (a truism, perhaps, but significant) and removed from quotidian reality. Keegan comments that these and other factors "make the fitness of modern man to sustain the stress of battle increasingly doubtful" (*The Face of Battle* 325). In the context of the current discussion, they also render doubtful the ability of Western culture to sustain its warrior-derived definitions of heroism and masculinity. As we have seen, masculinity owes its construction and nature, in its origins, chiefly to the experience of war; the masculine virtues are still, overwhelmingly, the martial virtues. But the martial experience is increasingly alien, even hostile, to that construction. Heroic, warrior-derived masculinity assumes, for example, that the warrior is admirable because he chooses to act admirably, that he is more admirable than other men--and therefore a model for them--because he chooses to act heroically when they do not. But, as Keegan points out, a soldier on a modern battlefield does not choose to act heroically; he is compelled to remain where he has been put, as are the soldiers under gas attack in "Dulce et Decorum Est," partly because "it is now almost impossible to run away from a battle" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 308). Keegan further notes that "modern battlefields, because so difficult to escape from, encourage among soldiers a siege mentality" (*The Face of Battle* 311), a position characterised by entrapment, passivity, resentment, and helplessness--all characteristics at odds with martial masculinity. Such was certainly true of the experience of trench warfare in the First World War, as Elaine Showalter has noted: "That most masculine of enterprises, the

Great War, the 'apocalypse of masculinism,' feminized its conscripts by taking away their sense of control" (173). In her historical novel about the First World War, *Regeneration* (1991), Pat Barker has W.H.R. Rivers come to the same troubled conclusion:

> One of the paradoxes of the war--one of the many--was that this most brutal of conflicts should set up a relationship between officers and men that was . . . domestic. Caring. As Layard would undoubtedly have said, maternal. And that wasn't the only trick the war had played. Mobilization. The Great Adventure. They'd been *mobilized* into holes in the ground so constricted they could hardly move. And the Great Adventure--the real life equivalent of all the adventure stories they'd devoured as boys--consisted of crouching in a dugout, waiting to be killed. The war that had promised so much in the way of "manly" activity had actually delivered feminine passivity, and on a scale that their mothers and sisters had scarcely known. No wonder they broke down. (107-8)

Some soldiers have always failed the test of manhood that a battle, whatever else it may be, is generally considered to be, but the size and lethal nature of modern battlefields preclude flight: "This 'right to flight' is naturally not one which generals are willing to concede. But its availability is one of the things which in the past have made battle bearable, by allowing the soldier to believe that his presence on the battlefield was ultimately voluntary" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 309). If the soldier's presence in battle cannot be thought of as in some way voluntary, the result of personal choice, but is instead finally and inescapably coerced, then it proves nothing about him except his passivity and lack of personal volition over so basic an act as the sacrifice of his life, and certainly not his manhood.

The mechanised, impersonal nature of so much of a modern soldier's job further erodes earlier conceptions of the heroic nature of the military life. "To meet a similarly equipped opponent," writes Keegan, "was the occasion for which the armoured soldier[110] trained perhaps every day of his life from the onset of manhood. To meet and beat him was a triumph, the highest form which self-expression could take in the medieval nobleman's way of life" (*The Face of Battle* 110). For "hand-to-hand warriors, fighting was an act of self-expression by which a man displayed not only his courage but his individuality" (Keegan, *A History of Warfare* 11). And such individualised action on the battlefield forces an awareness of the enemy that modern mechanised warfare emphatically does not: "Warfare in the age of edged weapons required yet another vanished military quality, perhaps even more crucial to skill-at-arms than agility or good reflexes: a sort of empathy with one's adversary, lending the ability to anticipate his actions and forestall his blows" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 314). But such one-on-one, individualised, personal combat between equals is no longer the characteristic form of battle: "Every trend in warfare since the end of the middle ages has been to make personal encounters on the battlefield between men of equal social status more and more difficult to arrange" (*The Face of Battle* 316). Soldiers now rarely see the people they fight and kill. In "Dulce et Decorum Est" the gas attack arrives unheralded and those who launched it are absent and unknown. Today's soldiers fight by computer and trigger mechanised attacks on depersonalised and often invisible targets.[iii] They are technicians, and their tasks bear little resemblance to the traditional skills of a warrior: "Archery, *épée*, and horsemanship are athletic feats, demanding poise, timing, and judgment which few modern military functions require and which correspondingly few soldiers, stronger and healthier though the majority certainly are than the soldiers of the age of edged weapons, can emulate" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 314). Keegan goes so far as to note the "reduction of his [the soldier's] status to that of a mere adjunct to machinery, the software in the system" (*The Face of Battle* 333). Maintenance of the heroic ideology of battle is hard to achieve in the face of such realities. In what way can "a mere adjunct to machinery" be conceived and represented as heroic?

---

[110] Keegan is writing specifically here of the mediaeval armoured knight, but his point is equally valid for any warrior society.

[iii] Recent research has indicated, however, that modern warfare is often neither as precise nor as technologically accurate as it seems. As David Perlmutter notes of the Gulf War (1991), news reports, filtered through the American military authorities, "promulgated a stereotype and an agenda that the Pentagon deliberately cultivated: American military technology was superior and we were fighting a precise tech-war" (198). But the reality on the ground was far messier than news reports indicated (Perlmutter 198-201). In the interest of good television and entertainment values, mainstream journalists seemed very willing to collude in what Perlmutter accurately calls "military boosterism" (200). That same willingness has been evident in reporting of the more recent Iraqi war, as well.

The impersonality and disconnectedness of the modern battlefield extends to the relationship between commanders and men. Modern commanders are rarely present on the battlefield, certainly not visibly present as earlier leaders often were. Modern communications enable them to direct battles more effectively from distant headquarters, and the size and lethal nature of the battlefield precludes any sort of personal command, such as earlier military leaders like Marlborough and Wellington both exercised. In the First World War, the distance of commanders from their men was the cause of a great deal of resentment, as expressed in Sassoon's short poem "The General" (1917):

> "Good-morning, good-morning!" the General said
> When we met him last week on our way to the line.
> Now the soldiers he smiled at are most of 'em dead,
> And we're cursing his staff for incompetent swine.
> "He's a cheery old card," grunted Harry to Jack
> As they slogged up to Arras with rifle and pack.
>
> . . .
>
> But he did for them both by his plan of attack. (78)

The British Expeditionary Force saw some of its worst trench fighting on the Western Front at Arras. In April 1917 the fighting there produced 130,000 casualties but no appreciable gain (except for the Canadians' spectacular capture of Vimy Ridge), largely because of what Keegan calls "the usual inflexibility of the plan" (*The First World War* 326). So Sassoon's poem represents what happened with horrifying accuracy. The horror is only accentuated by the cheerfulness of the metre, echoing the cheerfulness of the General himself, whose ill-made plans sent thousands of men, including the representative Harry and Jack, to their deaths. Plans for battles were made in distant headquarters, the size and lethalness of the battlefields made the presence of commanders impossible, and the lack of reliable radio communication with the men in the field meant that "a cloud of unknowing . . . descended on a First World War battlefield at zero hour" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 260-1). Marlborough and Wellington were able to respond quickly to changes in circumstances and enemy movements. World War I commanders could not: "Bombardment and barrage plans could be pre-ordained. They could not be altered once the fighting had begun" (Keegan, *The Mask of Command* 251). First World War high commands were normally as much as fifty miles from the front. What Keegan calls "chateau generalship" (*The Mask of Command* 333-4) opened up a gap between the generals who planned battles from safe positions far behind the lines and the soldiers in the field who fought the battles--and died in them--a gap that bred bred disconnection and resentment.[112] That resentment is apparent in "The General." It is even more pronounced in another of Sassoon's war poems, "Base Details," written at Rouen on 4 March 1917:

---

[112] That gap has become even larger with improvements in communications and weapons techology, enabling war to be waged "as much as possible at a distance, through bombing, whose targets can be chosen, on the basis of instantly relayed information and visualizing technology, from continents away: the daily bombing operations in Afghanistan in late 2001 and early 2002 were directed from US Central Command in Tampa, Florida" (Sontag 60). Of course the intention in this case is "to produce a sufficiently punishing number of casualties on the other side while minimizing opportunities for the enemy to inflict any casualties at all" (Sontag 60-61) while simultaneously protecting civilians at home from conscious knowledge of the suffering of the bombing's victims and maintaining the myth of a clean war.

> If I were fierce, and bald, and short of breath,
> I'd live with scarlet Majors at the Base,
> And speed glum heroes up the line to death.
> You'd see me with my puffy petulant face,
> Guzzling and gulping in the best hotel,
> Reading the Roll of Honour. "Poor young chap,"
> I'd say—"I used to know his father well;
> Yes, we've lost heavily in this last scrap."
> And when the war is done and youth stone dead,
> I'd toddle safely home and die--in bed. (71)

No conception of heroic leadership is possible in the face of such withering contempt. And while the men in the line are called heroes in this poem, they are glum and passive victims of their out-of-touch commanders, not initiators of manly action, but passive victims of the incompetence and sloth of those who are supposed to be leading and inspiring them. A leader like Wellington is simply not possible under such circumstances.

That impersonality and distance are crucial aspects of modern warfare, and separate it decisively from earlier forms of warfare, which were rooted much more firmly in "the world of men" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 321)--that is, in the world of quotidian reality in which we all live and breathe and have our being. Once, the rhythm of fighting and "its duration were . . . dictated by human limitations," and the events of a battle "belonged demonstrably to the world of men" (Keegan, *The Face of Battle* 320-1). Now they have been extended and transformed beyond recognition by mechanisation. Of the traditional masculine, warrior-derived virtues, virtually the only one still with any relevance is the willingness to endure hardship and suffering. But passive suffering, without the exercise of the will or the more active masculine and military virtues, reduces the warrior-hero to a mere victim, as Showalter and Barker also point out. As Keegan argues, modern warfare in the twentieth century may have reached or exceeded "some limit of what human beings could and could not stand on the battlefield" (*The Face of Battle* 283). It may also have reached the limit beyond which its increasingly tenuous relationship with ideal masculinity can no longer be maintained.

Or has it? Military virtues and military action are still intimately connected to national identity and worth. Graham Dawson notes that this was so in the Falklands War of 1982 and quotes Margaret Thatcher's speech on 3 July of that year:

> The lesson of the Falklands is that Britain has not changed and that this nation still has those sterling qualities which shine through our history. This generation can match their fathers' and grandfathers' abilities, in courage, and in resolution. We have not changed. When the demands of war and the dangers to our own people call us to arms,–then we British are as we have always been–competent, courageous and resolute. (15)

The myth of the nation, rooted still--despite all the experiences of the twentieth century and the realities of modern warfare, in martially-derived heroic masculinity--still has the power to move modern subjects of the nation. Although the deliverer of this speech was a woman, the gendering of the nation consequent to the rooting of national identity and worth in military virtues and identity goes unexamined. "The celebration of national greatness," as Dawson notes of this speech, "is simultaneously a celebration of national manhood" (15), and national manhood is still identified with and rooted in martially-derived heroic masculinity. Contemporary Britons are urged by Thatcher to look to the military accomplishments in war and the establishment and maintenance of Empire by their fathers and grandfathers for confirmation of British identity and for models of how to carry that identity forward into the modern world. Thus what Dawson calls "an essentialist discourse of Britishness" (13) is rooted in exactly the ancient models of martial masculinity that this dissertation has been examining.

The power of this model is not limited to the British Isles. It informs the contemporary sense in the American military that members of the armed forces are morally superior to the society they serve (Bacevich).[113] It lay at the unexamined heart of the hagiographic and overtly nationalistic memorial service for the four Canadian soldiers accidentally killed on 17 April 2002 in Afghanistan by American pilots. It lies at the equally unexamined heart of much American rhetoric attending the so-called "War on Terror" that sent the American military to Afghanistan and Iraq. And it lies, too, at the heart of much modern popular culture--such as the innumerable action-adventure films that dominate contemporary movie screens, especially during the Christmas and summer blockbuster seasons, and video and computer games centred on warmaking and performing the role of a warrior, a man leading other men into battle--created by or principally targeted at (and the martial metaphor is particularly appropriate here) young men. The appeal of heroic battle as depicted in *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy of films is still strong. In the films' epic battle scenes, the heroes of Middle Earth (and despite director Peter Jackson's and the screenwriters' attempt to increase the importance of female characters, the films are no less intensely masculinist in their narrative and their construction of heroism than are Tolkein's books) face the numberless enemy massed in anonymous ranks--and they win. On these battlefields, heroism is not only possible, it is the prerequisite to victory. The enemy's leaders are far away in their towers of Isengard and Barad Dûr, directing the battle by mystical knowledge, gained by evil means; the enemy's soldiers are anonymous in their monstrosity, relying on numbers, on monsters (trolls, Balrogs, Oliphaunts) and machinery (explosives, balls of inextinquishable flame, machines operated by gears and cranks) for victory, while the heroes form an army of individuals, led by kings and generals even more heroic than their men, who fight on a battlefield where glory and honour provide real incentives for heroic deeds. These warriors can both prove themselves men in battle and save the world while they do it.

---

[113] Andrew J. Bacevich reports that in a 2003 survey of American military personnel, "two-thirds [of those polled] said they think military members have higher moral standards than the nation they serve." Such attitudes, he notes, "leave even some senior officers more than a little uncomfortable," and he quotes retired Admiral Stanley Arthur as saying, "'More and more, enlisted as well as officers are beginning to feel that they are special, better than the society they serve.' Such tendencies, concluded Arthur, are 'not healthy in an armed force serving a democracy.'"

Although most North American and European men have and are likely to have no experience of the military role, the modern military bears little resemblance to a collection of warriors, women play an increasingly important role in the military of most nations, even as combatants (although, as noted above, soldiers are often little more than technicians, anyway), and ancient notions of heroism and valour are increasingly irrelevant to modern fighting, the identification of manhood with the warrior continues despite these and other challenges to its relevance. The men's movement that arose in the 1990s often uses the ideology of heroic masculinity, as in Rick Fields's 1991 book *The Code of the Warrior*: "Warriors, as we have seen, have a mission beyond themselves. The true warrior is dedicated to something greater than personal survival and comfort. The challenge for the business warrior, or the warrior who seeks warriorship through business or work, therefore is to find a way to make business serve more than personal or even corporate interest" (268). This use of the language and ideology of martial masculinity may be facile, but it nevertheless shows how available for use that ideology still is. Many in England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and many more who lived through the horrors of the First World War, would be astonished at how strongly it has survived. Andrew J. Bacevich makes a similar point in a recent article:

> The old 20th-century aesthetic of armed conflict as barbarism, brutality, ugliness, and sheer waste grew out of World War I, as depicted by writers such as Ernest Hemingway, Erich Maria Remarque, and Robert Graves. World War II, Korea, and Vietnam reaffirmed that aesthetic, in the latter case with films like *Apocalypse Now, Platoon*, and *Full Metal Jacket*.
>
> The intersection of art and war gave birth to two large truths. The first was that the modern battlefield was a slaughterhouse, and modern war an orgy of destruction that devoured guilty and innocent alike. The second, stemming from the first, was that military service was an inherently degrading experience and military institutions by their very nature repressive and inhumane. After 1914, only fascists dared to challenge these truths. Only fascists celebrated war and depicted armies as forward-looking – expressions of national unity and collective purpose that paved the way for utopia. To be a genuine progressive, liberal in instinct, enlightened in sensibility, was to reject such notions as preposterous.

Hovever, Bacevich continues,

> by the dawn of the 21st century the reigning postulates of technology-as-panacea had knocked away much of the accumulated blood-rust sullying war's reputation. Thus reimagined--and amidst widespread assurances that the United States could be expected to retain a monopoly on this new way of war--armed conflict regained an aesthetic respectability, even palatability, that the literary and artistic interpreters of twentieth-century military cataclysms were thought to have demolished once and for all. In the right circumstances, for the right cause, it now turned out, war could actually offer an attractive option--cost-effective, humane, even thrilling. Indeed, as the Anglo-American race to Baghdad conclusively demonstrated in the spring of 2003, in the eyes of many, war has once again become a grand pageant, performance art, or a perhaps temporary diversion from the ennui and boring routine of everyday life. As one observer noted with approval, "public enthusiasm for the whiz-bang technology of the U.S. military" had become "almost boyish." (Bacevich)

Clearly, the close identification of the masculine and the martial, and of the warrior and the nation, is still operative, as it was throughout much of the period under examination in this dissertation. But to insist that it must inevitably be so is to subscribe to an essentialist definition of gender that admits of no alteration. Graham Dawson critiques the radical feminism of the 1970s and 1980s that located "the source of patriarchy in a transcultural masculine nature, understood as a kind of will-to-power stemming from male aggression and issuing in acts of violence and destruction" (16). This sort of gender essentialism forecloses "any possibility of theorizing alternative or oppositional masculinities" (Dawson 17):

> A conception of the fundamentally martial nature of masculinity remained in place, the values ascribed to it being merely reversed from positive to negative. Where nationalism lauds the soldier as its ultimate expression, radical feminism denigrates him as the quintessence of masculine brutality. The naturalized equation of masculinity, military prowess and the nation is thereby effectively cemented. (Dawson 17)

But need it be? "Is it ever possible," Dawson asks, "to 'abandon' an identity so deeply rooted in the psyche?" (277). And so deeply rooted in history, one might add. Many Men's Studies theorists have pointed to what Jonathan Rutherford and Rowena Chapman call "the necessity for men to redefine masculinity, to imagine and produce new forms of sexual and erotic expression, to produce a masculinity whose desire is no longer dependent on oppression, no longer policed by homophobia, and one that no longer resorts to violence and misogyny to maintain its sense of coherence" (18). In an article in *The Journal of Men's Studies*, "Evolving Beyond the Adolescent Warrior: Postheroic Masculinist

Generativity," William G. Doty suggests replacing the warrior ideal of masculinity with an Eriksonian "Generative Mentor," which is more inclusive and dialectical, yet still rooted in cultural norms and dependent on ritual (365, 367). Anthropologists like David D. Gilmore have studied a variety of constructions of masculinity, concluding that "manliness is a symbolic script, a cultural construct, endlessly variable and not always necessary" (Gilmore 230). Leo Braudy, in his recent book on the nature and history of martial masculinity, wonders if "the most recent form of terrorism"[114] is "the last gasp of a militant warrior personality type that has survived the centuries" (551), and looks forward to the opportunities offered by "the conjunction of a fundamentalist warrior-oriented terrorism and an industrialized world willing to accept a wider spectrum of both male and female possibilities" in hopes that it might prove a necessary "step in the emancipation of the human race from its own mind-forged manacles" (554). The perhaps surprising survival of the ideology of heroic masculinity is rooted partly in the continuing pervasiveness of war; since 1945, one scholar calculates, "there have been only 26 days of world peace . . . and some 150 wars have been fought or continue to be fought under such guises as traditional wars between nation states, border clashes, preventative incursions, punitive expeditions, revolutions, civil wars, 'dirty wars,' police actions, state terrorism, peacekeeping missions, anti-insurgency campaigns, ethnic cleansings, and humanitarian interventions" (Perlmutter 11). It is hardly surprising that people should cling to a familiar way of valorising a reality otherwise so horrifying. Such an ideological survival is rooted also in very real anxiety about masculine identity, an anxiety born of the need constantly to affirm and display that identity through performance. Men must not simply be men, they must perform manhood, and hence are subject to necessary and continuing anxiety about the quality of their performance. Martially-derived heroic masculinity mandates performance--activity is of its essence--and hence simultaneously assuages anxiety and engenders it. The appeal of the ideology of heroic masculinity and the military heroes who exemplify it is powerful, but it can be resisted. It has been resisted before, as it was so widely in England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. If it has been resisted before, it can be resisted again, and the massively destructive potential of twenty-first century warfare may force us to resist it more fully, more finally, and more fruitfully than ever before.

---

[114] It is worth noting that Braudy is an American writing in the wake of the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001.

WORKS CITED

Adams, Carol. "The Sexual Politics of Meat." *The Polity Reader in Gender Studies*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994. 299-304.

Addison, Joseph. *The Poetical Works*. Ed. George Gilfillan. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1859.

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992.

Aldington, Richard. *Death of a Hero*. (1929) Intro. Christopher Ridgway. London: The Hogarth Press, 1984.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London and New York: Verso, 1983, 1991.

Anderson, M.S. *War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618-1789*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1988, 1998.

Anderson, William. *Castles of Europe from Charlemagne to the Renaissance.* Hertfordshire: Omega Books, 1984.

Ashley, Maurice. *Charles II*. Frogmore, St Albans, Herts: Panther, 1973.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. (1813) Ed. James Kinsley. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1980, 1998.

Bacevich, Andrew J. "The Normalization of War." *Alternet*. 21 April 2005. 22 April 2005. <http://alternet.org/story/21827/>

Backscheider, Paula R. *Daniel Defoe: His Life*. Baltimore and London: Johns

Hopkins UP, 1989.

—. Introduction. *A Short Narrative of the Life and Actions of His Grace John, D. of Marlborough*. [Daniel Defoe.] (1711) The Augustan Reprint Society. Publication Number 168. Los Angeles: University of California, 1974. i-xv.

Bainbridge, Simon. *British Poetry and the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars: Visions of Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

—. *Napoleon and English Romanticism*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Baird, John. "Whig and Tory Panegyrics: Addison's *The Campaign* and Philips's *Bleinheim* Reconsidered." *Lumen* 16 (1997): 163-77.

Barber, Richard. *The Reign of Chivalry*. New York: St. Martin's, 1980.

Barker, Pat. *Regeneration*. New York: Plume/Penguin, 1991, 1993.

Barnett, Correlli. *Marlborough*. London: Eyre Methuen: 1974.

Barnie, John. *War in Medieval English Society: Social Values in the Hundred Years War 1337-99*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1974.

The Battle of Maldon. Trans. Donald Scragg. *The Battle of Maldon A.D. 991*. Ed. Donald Scragg. Oxford: Basil Blackwell in association with the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991. 18-31.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books, 1952.

Bell, Ian A. *Henry Fielding: Authorship and Authority*. London and New York: Longman, 1994.

Bennett, Betty T. Introduction. *British War Poetry in the Age of Romanticism: 1793-*

1815. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976. 1-67.

Bennett, Betty T. Preface. *British War Poetry in the Age of Romanticism: 1793-1815*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976. ix-xii.

Bennett, Martyn. *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638-51*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

Beowulf: A New Verse Translation. Trans. Seamus Heaney. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000.

Berry, Boyd M. "Puritan Soldiers in *Paradise Lost*." *MLQ* 35 (1974): 376-402.

Bibby, Michael. *Hearts and Minds: Bodies, Poetry, and Resistance in the Vietnam Era*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1996.

Bibby, Michael, ed. *The Vietnam War and Postmodernity*. Boston: U of Massachussetts P, 1999.

Boren, Henry C. *Roman Society: A Social, Economic, and Cultural History*. 2nd ed. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992.

Bornstein, Diane. *Mirrors of Courtesy*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1975.

Bowden, Hugh. "Hoplites and Homer: Warfare, Hero Cult, and the Ideology of the Polis." *War and Society in the Greek World*. Ed. John Rich and Graham Shipley. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. 45-64.

Bowden, Muriel. *A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales*. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Braudy, Leo. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003.

Breihan, John, and Clive Caplan. "Jane Austen and the Militia." *Persuasions* 14 (16

December 1992): 16-26.

Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Brod, Harry. "The Case for Men's Studies." *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987. 39-62.

Brooke, Rupert. *The Collected Poems*. Intro. George Edward Woodberry. Toronto and Montreal: McClelland & Stewart, 1915, 1943.

Brown, David. *Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Buckingham, Duke of, George Villiers. *The Rehearsal*. (1671) Ed. D.E.L. Crane. Durham: University of Durham, 1976.

Budra, Paul, and Michael Zeitlin, ed. *Soldier Talk: The Vietnam War in Oral Narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004.

Buntz, Veit. "'Hammered Out of Artillery Shells': The Discourse of Trauma in Vietnam Veterans' Poetry." *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 48 (2003): 227-48.

Burney, Fanny. *Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay*. Ed. Charlotte Barrett. 6 vols. London: Macmillan, 1905.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge, 1990, 1999.

Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1965.

Byron, George Gordon, Lord. *Don Juan*. Ed. T.G. Steffan, E. Steffan, and W.W.

Pratt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1973, 1996.

—. *Letters and Journals*. Ed. Leslie A. Marchand. 12 vols. Cambridge, Massachussetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1982.

—. *Poems*. Oxford Standard Authors. London: Oxford UP, 1904, 1945, 1960.

Campbell, James. "Combat Gnosticism: The Ideology of First World War Poetry Criticism." *New Literary History* 30.1 (1999): 203-15.

Campbell, John Lorne, ed. and trans. *Highland Songs of the Forty-Five*. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1933.

Cannadine, David. *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy*. New York: Vintage, 1990, 1999.

Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*. (1841) London: Oxford UP, 1928.

Carnochan, W.B. "Dryden's Alexander." *The English Hero*. Ed. Robert Folkenflik. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1982; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1982. 46-60.

Carver, Larry. "*Absalom and Achitophel* and the Father Hero." *The English Hero*. Ed. Robert Folkenflik. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1982; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1982. 35-45.

Chandler, David. *Marlborough as Military Commander*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1973.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales*. *The Riverside Chaucer*. 3rd ed. Gen. Ed. Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987. 3-328.

Chidester, Stephanie. "Scott as Jacobite: Reason and Romance in *Kenilworth* and *The Abbot*." *Encyclia* 68 (1991): 315-26.

Churchill, Winston S. *Marlborough: His Life and Times*. 4 vols. London: George G. Harrap, 1933-38.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1992.

Congreve, William. *The Complete Works: The Fourth Volume. Containing Congreve's Poems, the Preface to Dryden, and the Tatler*. Ed. Montague Summers. London: The Nonesuch Press, 1923.

Cowles, Virginia. *The Great Marlborough and his Duchess*. New York: Macmillan, 1983.

Crane, D.E.L. "Introduction." *The Rehearsal*. George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Ed. D.E.L. Crane. Durham: University of Durham, 1978. vii-xiii.

Croally, N.T. *Euripidean Polemic: The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Daiches, David. *Charles Edward Stuart: The Life and Times of Bonnie Prince Charlie*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1973.

David, Alfred. "A Note on Names." *Beowulf: A New Verse Translation*. Trans. Seamus Heaney. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000. xxxi.

Davies, Godfrey. *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1955.

Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Maculinities*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

[Defoe, Daniel.] *A Short Narrative of the Life and Actions of His Grace John, D. of Marlborough*. (1711) Intro. Paula R. Backscheider. The Augustan Reprint

Society. Publication Number 168. Los Angeles: University of California, 1974.

Donnelly, M.L. "'Ostentation Vain of Fleshly Arm': Milton's Revaluation of the Heroic Celebration of Military Virtue." *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1999. 202-219.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

—. Introduction. *The Female Quixote*. Charlotte Lennox. Ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1989. xi-xxxii.

Doty, William G. "Evolving Beyond the Adolescent Warrior: Postheroic Masculinist Generativity." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 2 (1994): 353-73.

Downie, J.A. "*The Conduct of the Allies*: The Question of Influence." *The Art of Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Clive T. Probyn. London: Vision, 1978. 108-28.

Dryden, John. *Essays*. Ed. W.P. Ker. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.

—. *Poems 1649-85*. Ed. Paul Hammond. Longman Annotated English Poets. 2 vols. Harlow, Essex and New York: Longman, 1995.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Earl, James W. "*Beowulf* and the Origins of Civilization." *Speaking Two Languages: Traditional Disciplines and Contemporary Theory in Medieval Studies*. Ed. Allen J. Frantzen. Albany, NY: SUNY, 1991. 65-89.

Edgeworth, Maria. *Letters from England 1813-1844*. Ed. Christina Colvin. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age*. 3 vols. London: Methuen, 1967.

Elias, Richard. "'Bayes' in Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*." *English Language Notes* 15 (1978): 178-81.

Emsler, Clive. *British Society and the French Wars 1793-1815*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979.

Euripides. *The Women of Troy*. *Euripides: The War Plays*. Trans. Don Taylor. London: Methuen, 1990. 75-131.

Fallon, Robert Thomas. *Captain or Colonel: The Soldier in Milton's Life and Art*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1984.

Farrell, William J. "The Mock-Heroic Form of *Jonathan Wild*." *Modern Philology* 63 (1966): 216-226.

Favret, Mary A. "Coming Home: The Public Spaces of Romantic War." *Studies in Romanticism* 33 (1994): 539-48.

Feather, John. *A History of British Publishing*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988, 1991.

Field, Ophelia. *The Favourite: Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2002.

Fielding, Henry. *Joseph Andrews and Shamela*. Oxford World's Classics. Ed. Douglas Brooks-Davies. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966, 1979, 1991.

---. *The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great*. Ed. David Nokes. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1982.

Fields, Rick. *The Code of the Warrior in History, Myth and Everyday Life*. New York:

HarperPerennial, 1991.

Fitzgerald, William Thomas. "The Battle of Waterloo." *British War Poetry in the Age of Romanticism: 1793-1815*. Ed. Betty T. Bennett. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976. 492-4.

Folkenflik, Robert. Introduction. *The English Hero, 1660-1800*. Ed. Robert Folkenflik. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1982; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1982. 9-21.

Foot, Michael. *The Pen and the Sword*. London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957.

Forbes, Robert. *The Lyon in Mourning, or a Collection of Speeches Letters Journals etc. Relative to the Affairs of Prince Charles Edward Stuart*. Ed. Henry Paton. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1975.

Foxhall, Lin. Introduction. *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 1-5.

—. Introduction. *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 1-9.

—. "Natural Sex: The Attribution of Sex and Gender to Plants in Ancient Greece." *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 57-70.

Foxon, D.F. *English Verse 1701-1750*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975.

France, John. *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1000-1300*. Ithaca, New

York: Cornell UP, 1999.

Frank, Roberta. "*The Battle of Maldon*: Its Reception 1726-1906." *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* Ed. Helen Damico and John Leyerle. Studies in Medieval Culture XXXII. Medieval Institute Publications. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1993. 29-46.

Frantzen, Allen J. *Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from Beowulf to Angels in America*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1998.

Freeman, James A. *Milton and the Martial Muse: Paradise Lost and European Traditions of War*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

Frost, Frank J. *Greek Society*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1971.

Fry, Donald K. "Introduction: The Artistry of *Beowulf*." *The Beowulf Poet: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Donald K. Fry. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 1-7.

Fulford, Tom. "Sighing for a Soldier: Jane Austen and Military Pride and Prejudice." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 57 (2002): 153-78.

A Full Collection of all Poems upon Charles, Prince of Wales. Edinburgh, 1745.

Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975, 2000.

Garlick, Harry. *The Final Curtain: State Funerals and the Theatre of Power*. Studies in Comparative Literature 24. Amsterdam and Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi, 1999.

Giddings, Robert. "Delusive Seduction: Pride, Pomp, Circumstance and Military

Music." *Popular Imperialism and the Military, 1850-1950*. Ed. John M. MacMenzie. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1992. 25-49.

Gilfillan, George. "The Life of Joseph Addison." *The Poetical Works of Joseph Addison*. Ed. George Gilfillan. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1959. xi-xxxiii.

Gilmore, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1990.

Glover, Richard. *Peninsular Preparation: The Reform of the British Army 1795-1809*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1963.

Godschalk, William Leigh. "Prior's Copy of Spenser's *Works* (1679)." *Bibliographical Society of America Papers* 61 (1967): 52-5.

Gordon, Robert C. "Jonathan Swift and the Modern Art of War." *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1980): 187-202.

Grant, Michael, and John Hazel. *Gods and Mortals in Classical Mythology: A Dictionary*. New York: Dorset Press, 1979.

Green, David. *Blenheim*. London: William Collins Sons, 1974.

Green, Douglas E. "Interpreting 'her martyr'd signs': Gender and Tragedy in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 317-326.

Griffin, Dustin. "The Bard of Cyder-Land: John Philips and Miltonic Imitation." *SEL* 24 (1984): 441-60.

Guedalla, Philip. *The Duke*. (1931) Wordsworth Military Library. Ware, Hartfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1997.

Hall, Edith. "Asia Unmanned: Images of Victory in Classical Athens." *War and Society in The Greek World*. Ed. John Rich and Graham Shipley. London and

New York: Routledge, 1993. 108-34.

Hall, Stuart. Introduction. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London: Sage Publications, 1997. 1-11.

Hammond, Paul. "Annus Mirabilis." *The Poems of John Dryden 1649-85*. Vol. 1: 1649-81. Ed. Paul Hammond. Longman Annotated English Poets. 2 vols. Harlow, Essex and New York: Longman, 1995. 106-10.

Hazareesingh, Sudhir. *The Legend of Napoleon*. London, Granta Books, 2004.

Hibbert, Christopher. *Wellington: A Personal History*. London: HarperCollins, 1997, 1998.

Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. 2nd edn. New York: Norton, 1980.

---. *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*. London: Faber and Faber, 1984.

---. *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion, and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

---. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972, 1975.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Elements of Philosophy*. Ed. Sir William Molesworth. London: John Bohn, 1839. Vol. I of *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*. Ed. Sir William Molesworth. 11 vols.

Hogg, James. *The Jacobite Relics of Scotland*. (1819-21) Ed. Murray G.H. Pittock. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2002.

Holmes, Geoffrey, and W.A. Speck. *The Divided Society: Parties and Politics in*

England 1694-1716. Documents of Modern History. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

Hooker, Edward N. "The Purpose of Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 10 (1946): 49-67. Rptd. in *Essential Articles: John Dryden*. Ed. H.T. Swedenberg, Jr. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1966. 281-99.

Horn, Robert D. *Marlborough: A Survey. Panegyrics, Satires, and Biographical Writings, 1688-1788*. New York and London: Garland, 1975.

Howarth, David. *Waterloo: A Near Run Thing*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1968, 1972.

Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1950, 1955.

—. *The Waning of the Middle Ages*. (1924) Trans. F. Hopman. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1985.

Hunt, Leigh. *Captain Sword and Captain Pen*. (1835) Intro. Rhodes Dunlap. Iowa City: Friends of the U of Iowa Libraries, 1984.

Hynes, Samuel. *The Soldier's Tale: Bearing Witness to Modern War*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1997.

—. *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*. London: The Bodley Head, 1990.

Irving, Edward B., Jr. "Heroic Role-Models: Beowulf and Others." *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr*. Ed. Helen Damico and John Leyerle. Studies in Medieval Culture XXXII. Medieval Institute Publications. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan

University, 1993. 347-72.

Irwin, William Robert. *The Making of Jonathan Wild: A Study in the Literary Method of Henry Fielding*. New York: Columbia UP, 1941.

Jarrett, Derek. *England in the Age of Hogarth*. London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon, 1974.

Johnson, Edgar. *Sir Walter Scott: The Great Unknown*. 2 vols. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1970.

Johnson, James William. "England, 1660-1800: An Age without a Hero?" *The English Hero, 1660-1800*. Ed. Robert Folkenflik. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1982; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1982. 25-34.

Johnson, Samuel. *Lives of the English Poets*. 2 vols. Ed. Arthur Waugh. London: Oxford UP, 1906, 1952.

Jones, Archer. *The Art of Warfare in the Western World*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987, 1989.

Jones, J.R. *Marlborough*. British Lives. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Jordan, Gerald, and Nicholas Rogers. "Admirals as Heroes: Patriotism and Liberty in Hanoverian England." *Journal of British Studies* 28 (1989): 201-224.

Kahn, Coppélia. *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: U of California P, 1981.

---. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Karras, Ruth Mazo. *From Boys to Men: Formations of Maculinity in Late Medieval*

Europe. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.

Keegan, John. *The Face of Battle*. London: Pimlico, 1976.

—. *The First World War*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1998, 2000.

—. *A History of Warfare*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1993, 1994.

—. *The Mask of Command: A Study of Generalship*. London: Pimlico, 1987, 1999.

Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1984.

—. "Introduction: Warfare and the Middle Ages." *Medieval Warfare: A History*. Ed. Maurice Keen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 1-9.

King, Bruce. *Seventeenth-Century English Literature*. Macmillan History of Literature. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1982.

Knapp, Lewis Mansfield. *Tobias Smollett: Doctor of Men and Manners*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1949, 1963.

Lamont, Claire. "Jacobite Songs as Intertexts in *Waverley* and *The Highland Widow*." *Scott in Carnival*. Ed. J.H. Alexander and David Hewitt. Selected Papers from the Fourth International Scott Conference Edinburgh, 1991. Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1993. 110-21.

Laskowski, William E. *Rupert Brooke*. Twayne's English Authors Series. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1994.

Lees, Clare A. "Men and *Beowulf*." *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Clare A. Lees, Thelma Fenster, and Jo Ann McNamara. Medieval Cultures, Volume 7. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994. 129-48.

Lennartz, Norbert. "Re-mapping Romanticism: Lord Byron--Britian's First Anti-

Romantic." *Remapping Romanticism: Gender--Text--Context*. Ed. Christoph Bode and Fritz-Wilhelm Neumann. Selected Papers Delivered at the Symposium of the "Gesellschaft für Englische Romantik" held at the University of Erfurt (November 1999). Essen: Verlag Die Blaue Eule, 2001. 101-112.

Longford, Elizabeth. *Wellington: Pillar of State*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

---. *Wellington: The Years of the Sword*. London: Panther, 1969, 1971.

Lucas, John. *England and Englishness: Ideas of Nationhood in English Poetry 1688-1900*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1990.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The History of England from the Accession of James II.* (1848-56) 5 vols. Ed. Charles Harding Firth. Intro. Peter Rowland. London: The Folio Press, 1986.

Macinnes, Allan I. *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603-1788*. East Linton, East Lothian: Tuckwell, 1996.

MacKenzie, John M., ed. *Popular Imperialism and the Military, 1850-1950*. Studies in Imperialism. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1992.

Mancoff, Debra N. *The Return of King Arthur: The Legend Through Victorian Eyes*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995.

Marchand, Leslie A. *Byron: A Portrait*. London: The Cresset Library, 1970, 1987.

The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence. 3 vols. Ed. Henry L. Snyder. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1975.

Marples, Morris. *Poor Fred and the Butcher: Sons of George II*. London: Michael Joseph, 1970.

Marvell, Andrew. "The Last Instructions to a Painter." *The Complete Poems*. Ed. Elizabeth Story Donno. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972, 1996. 157-83.

McCrea, Brian. *Henry Fielding and the Politics of Mid-Eighteenth-Century England.* Athens, Georgia: U of Georgia P, 1981.

McLynn, Frank. *Charles Edward Stuart: A Tragedy in Many Acts.* London and New York: Routledge: 1988.

McNeil, David. *The Grotesque Depiction of War and the Military in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction.* Newark: U of Delaware P, 1990.

Melrose, Andrew. "Writing 'The End of Uncertainty': Imaginary Law, Imaginary Jacobites and Imaginary History in Walter Scott's *Heart of Midlothian* and *Redgauntlet.*" *Scottish Literary Journal* 25.2 (1998): 34-44.

Messina, Joseph. "The Heroic Image in *The Last Instructions to a Painter.*" *Tercentenary Essays in Honor of Andrew Marvell.* Ed. Kenneth Friedenreich. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1977. 297-310.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost. Complete Poems and Major Prose.* Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Macmillan, 1957. 207-469.

Mitchell, Margaret. *Gone With the Wind.* (1936) New York: Avon, 1973.

Moorman, Charles. *A Knyght There Was: The Evolution of the Knight in Literature.* Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1967.

Moss, Mark. *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

Murray, Jacqueline. Introduction. *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities:*

Men in the Medieval West. Ed. Jacqueline Murray. Garland Medieval Casebooks Volume 25. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.

Murrin, Michael. *History and Warfare in Renaissance Epic*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1994.

Newsome, David. *The Victorian World Picture: Perceptions and Introspections in an Age of Change*. London: Fontana Press, 1997, 1998.

Nixon, Sean. "Exhibiting Masculinity." *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London: Sage Publications, 1997. 291-330.

Nokes, David. Introduction. *Jonathan Wild*. Henry Fielding. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1982. 7-24.

Norgate, Paul. "Wilfrid Owen and the Soldier Poets." *Review of English Studies* n.s. 40 (1989): 516-30.

Novak, Maximillian E. "Warfare and Its Discontents in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Or, Why Eighteenth-Century Fiction Failed to Produce a *War and Peace*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 4 (1992): 185-205.

Oates, Mary I. "Jonson, Congreve, and Gray: Pindaric Essays in Literary History." *SEL* 19 (1979): 387-406.

Ogilvie, R.M. *Latin and Greek: A History of the Influence of the Classics on English Life from 1600- 1918*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964.

Oldmixon, John. *A Pastoral Poem on the Victories at Schellenburgh and Bleinheim*. London: A. Baldwin, 1704.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Mary M. Innes. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1955.

Owen, Wilfred. *The Collected Poems*. Ed. C. Day Lewis. London: Chatto & Windus, 1971.

The Oxford Companion to British History. Revised edition. Ed. John Cannon. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Patterson, Lee. *Chaucer and the Subject of History*. Madison, Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Pears, Iain. "The Gentleman and the Hero: Wellington in the Nineteenth Century." *Myths of the English*. Ed. Roy Porter. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. 216-36.

Peck, John. *War, the Army and Victorian Literature*. Houndmills, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1998.

Pennington, Donald. "The War and the People." *Reactions to the English Civil War*. Ed. John Morrill. London: Macmillan, 1982. 115-135.

Perlmutter, David D. *Visions of War: Picturing Warfare from the Stone Age to the Cyber Age*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

Philips, John. *Poems*. Ed. M.G. Lloyd Thomas. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1927.

Pittock, Murray G.H. *Jacobitism*. British History in Perspective. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

---. *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge Studies in Eighteenth-Century English Literature and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Porter, Roy. *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*. London: Penguin, 2000.

Prebble, John. *Culloden*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1961.

Prest, Wilfrid. *Albion Ascendant: English History, 1660-1815*. The Short Oxford History of the Modern World. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Prior, Matthew. *Literary Works*. 2 vols. Ed. H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Purkiss, Diane. "Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity." *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1999. 220-41.

Rawson, Claude. "Henry Fielding." *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 120-152.

---. "Pope's Waste Land: Reflections on Mock-Heroic." *Essays and Studies* 35 (1982): 45-65.

Richards, Jeffrey. "Popular Imperialism and the Image of the Army in Juvenile Literature." *Popular Imperialism and the Military, 1850-1950*. Ed. John M. MacMenzie. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1992. 80-108.

Ricks, Christopher. "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington." *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1989. 488-9.

Riebling, Barbara. "England Deflowered and Unmanned: The Sexual Image of Politics in Marvell's 'Last Instructions.'" *SEL* 35 (1995): 137-57.

Rippy, Frances Mayhew. *Matthew Prior*. Twayne's English Authors Series. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.

Roberts, Andrew. *Napoleon and Wellington*. London: Phoenix Press, 2001.

Roberts, Jeanne Addison. *The Shakespearean Wild: Geography, Genus, and Gender*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1991.

Roberts, John L. *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745*. Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002.

Robertson, Fiona. "Of Speculation and Return: Scott's Jacobites, John Law, and the Company of the West." *Scottish Literary Journal* 24.1 (1997): 5-24.

Rochester, Earl of, John Wilmot. *The Complete Poems*. Ed. David M. Vieth. New Haven: Yale UP, 1968.

Roebuck, Graham. "Cavalier." *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1999. 9-25.

Rogers, Jonathan. "'We Saw a New Created Day': Restoration Revisions of Civil War Apocalypse." *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1999. 186-201.

Rogers, Pat. *Hacks and Dunces: Pope, Swift and Grub Street*. London and New York: Methuen, 1972, 1980.

Root, Christina M. "History as Character: Byron and the Myth of Napoleon." *History and Myth: Essays on English Romantic Literature*. Ed. Stephen C. Behrendt. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1990. 149-65.

Rosen, David. *The Changing Fictions of Masculinity*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993.

Rosenberg, Albert. "Prior's Feud with the Duchess of Marlborough." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 52 (1953): 27-30.

Rosenblum, Nancy L. "Ro[illegible]tic Militarism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 43 (1982): 249-68.

Rowse, A.L. *The Early Churchills*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1958.

Rutherford, Jonathan. *Forever England: Reflections on Masculinity and Empire*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1997.

Rutherford, Jonathan, and Rowena Chapman. "Introduction: The Forward March of Men Halted." *Male Order: Unwrapping Masculinity*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1988. 9-18.

Saintsbury, George. Introduction. *Dryden: Three Plays*. Ed. George Saintsbury. A Mermaid Dramabook. New York: Hill and Wang, n.d. vii-xxv.

Sassoon, Siegfried. *The War Poems*. Ed. Rupert Hart-Davis. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.

Schwenger, Peter. "The Masculine Mode." *Speaking of Gender*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. 101-12.

Schwoerer, Lois G. *"No Standing Armies!" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1974.

Scott, Sir Walter. *The Field of Waterloo*. In *The Complete Poetical Works*. Cambridge Edition. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1900. 362-9.

---. "From his Unsigned Review, *Quarterly Review*." (October 1816) *Byron: The*

Critical Heritage. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970.

Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. The Oxford Shakespeare. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.

Shaw, George Bernard. *The Devil's Disciple*. (1897) *Three Plays for Puritans*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. Intro. Michael Billington. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 2000.

Shaw, Philip. *Waterloo and the Romantic Imagination*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Shipley, Graham. "Introduction: The Limits of War." *War and Society in the Greek World*. Ed. John Rich and Graham Shipley. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. 1-24.

Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1985.

Sitter, John. "The Flight from History in Mid-Century Poetry." *Modern Essays on Eighteenth-Century Literature*. Ed. Leopold Damrosch, Jr. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. 412-35.

Smiles, Samuel. *Self Help. With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance*. (1859) Centenary Edition. Intro. Asa Briggs. London: John Murrary, 1958.

Smith, Bruce R. *Shakespeare and Masculinity*. Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1994.

Smollett, Tobias. "The Tears of Scotland." In *Poems, Plays, and The Briton*. Intro. Byron Gassman. Ed. O.M. Brack, Jr. and Leslie A. Chilton. Athens and London: The U of Georgia P, 1993. 23-26.

Sontag, Susan. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. London: Penguin, 2003.

Speck, W.A. *The Butcher: The Duke of Cumberland and the Suppression of the '45*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

Stanhope, Philip Henry, Earl. *Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington, 1831-1851*. (1886, 1888) Intro. Elizabeth Longford. Prion Lost Treasures. London: Prion, 1998.

Stimpson, Catharine R. Foreward. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987. xi-xiii.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1972, 1986.

Summers, Claude J., and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Introduction. *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1999. 1-8.

Sutherland, Kathryn. "Byrhtnoth's Eighteenth-Century Context." *The Battle of Maldon A.D. 991*. Ed. Donald Scragg. Oxford: Basil Blackwell in association with the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 1991. 183-95.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Conduct of the Allies*. Ed. C.B. Wheeler. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1916.

Taylor, Don. Introduction. *Euripides: The War Plays*. Trans. Don Taylor. London: Methuen: 1990. vii-xlx.

Taylor, Paul Beekman. "The Uncourteous Knights of *The Canterbury Tales.*" *English Studies* 72 (1991): 209-18.

Tennyson, Alfred, Lord. "The Charge of the Light Brigade." *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1989. 508-11.

---. "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington." *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Ed Christopher Ricks. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1989. 489-99.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The History of Pendennis*. Ed. John Sutherland. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.

Thomas, M.G. Lloyd. Introduction. *The Poems of John Philips*. Ed. M.G. Lloyd Thomas. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1927. ix-xliv.

Thompson, Neville. *Wellington after Waterloo*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Thomson, John A.F. *The Transformation of Medieval England 1370-1529*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.

Tolkien, J.R.R. "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics." (1936) *The Beowulf Poet: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Donald K. Fry. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968. 8-56.

Tomasson, Katherine, and Francis Buist. *Battles of the '45*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1962, 1978.

Travers, Tim. "The Relativity of War: British Military Memoirs from the Campaigns of Marlborough to the First World War." *Political Memoir:*

Essays on the Politics of Memory. Ed. George Egerton. London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd, 1994. 151-66.

van der Zee, Henri, and Barbara van der Zee. *William and Mary*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1973, 1988.

Verney, Peter. *The Battle of Blenheim*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1976.

Webb, Timothy. "Byron and the Heroic Syllables." *Keats-Shelley Review* 5 (Autumn 1990): 41-74.

Wellesley, Gerald, the Seventh Duke of Wellington, ed. *Wellington and his Friends: Letters of the First Duke of Wellington to the Rt. Hon. Charles and Mrs. Arbuthnot, the Earl and Countess of Wilton, Princess Lieven, and Miss Burdett-Coutts*. London: Macmillan, 1965.

Wellesley, Lord Gerald, and John Steegmann. *The Iconography of the First Duke of Wellington*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1935.

Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare on Masculinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Western, J.R. *The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century: The Story of a Political Issue 1660-1802*. London and Toronto: Routledge & Kegan Paul and U of Toronto P, 1965.

Wheeler, C.B. Introduction. *The Conduct of the Allies*. (1711) Jonathan Swift. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1916. xi-xlix.

Wicks, Stephen. *Warriors and Wildmen: Men, Masculinity, and Gender*. Westport, Connecticut and London: Bergin & Garvey, 1996.

Williams, Carolyn D. *Pope, Homer, and Manliness: Some Aspects of Eighteenth-*

Century Learning. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Williams, Jeffrey C. "The Myth of the Lost Generation: The British War Poets and their Modern Critics." *Clio* 12:1 (1982): 45-56.

Wilson, Kathleen. *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Winn, James Anderson. *John Dryden and His World*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1987.

Wright, H. Bunker, and Monroe K. Spears, ed. *The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1959.

Wroughton, John. *An Unhappy Civil War: The Experiences of Ordinary People in Gloucestershire, Somerset and Wiltshire, 1642-1646*. Bath: The Lansdowne Press, 1999.